

1129

No. 3081

United States Circuit Court of Appeals

For the Ninth Circuit

MINERALS SEPARATION, LTD.,
ET AL,

Appellees,

vs.

BUTTE & SUPERIOR MINING
COMPANY,

Appellant.

Transcript of Record

Volume 5

(Pages 2197 to 2868, Inclusive)

UPON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT
OF MONTANA

FILED
JUN 12 1918

District
In the ~~Circuit~~ Court of the United
States, Ninth Circuit, District
of Montana

Minerals Separation ~~Company~~,
Limited, a Corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Butte & Superior Mining Company,
a Corporation,

Defendant.

No. 8
In Equity.

BEFORE:

HON. GEORGE M. BOURQUIN, Judge Presiding.

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Henry D. Williams, of New York.

Odell W. McConnell, Esq., of Helena.

L. M. Garrison, Esq.

William Houston Kenyon, Esq.

For the Defendant:

Messrs. Kremer, Sanders & Kremer.

Messrs. Sheridan, Wilkinson & Scott of Chi-
cago.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the above entitled cause came on regularly for hearing in the above entitled court on Monday, April 16th, 1917, at 10:00 o'clock a. m., before the Hon. George M. Bourquin, Judge Presiding, the plaintiff being represented by its attorneys, Henry D. Williams of New York, Odell W. McConnell of Helena, L. M. Garrison and William Houston Kenyon, both of New York, and the defendant being represented by its attorneys, Messrs. Kremer, Sanders & Kremer, and Messrs. Sheridan, Wilkinson & Scott of Chicago.

WHEREUPON the following proceedings were had and done, to-wit:

Mr. Williams:

If your honor please, I will state to counsel for the defendant, that prior to proceeding with the trial of the suit of Minerals Separation, Limited, against the Butte & Superior Mining Company, counsel for Minerals Separation, Limited, desire to close up the suit against Hyde, which your honor will remember was argued in this court some four years ago, and has passed on to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States has substantially affirmed your honor's opinion, and the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States has been returned to this court, and I believe upon the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States an interlocutory decree has been entered according to the mandate, that interlocutory decree amending the original interlocutory decree by eliminating claims 9, 10 and 11 of the patent

sued and found invalid, and containing statements pursuant to the decree and the mandate of the Supreme Court that claims 9, 10 and 11 are invalid. Now, since the mandate of the Supreme Court, which was issued on the 13th day of January of the present year, consideration has been given to the finding of the Supreme Court that the patent in suit should be confined to the results obtained by the use of a fraction of one per cent of oil, pursuant to the specification of the patent. The Supreme Court of the United States had before it the entire patent, and the Supreme Court stated that the patent should be so confined, and for the purpose of so confining it, adjudged that claims 9, 10, 11, which were before this court, were invalid.

In order to follow the letter and substance of the Supreme Court decision, in order to limit the patent to the results obtained by the use of a fraction of one per cent of oil, the patentees have filed in the Patent Office a disclaimer of claims 9, 10, and 11 as drawn.

Now in the Hyde suit, the final decree which we have prepared for the purpose of terminating that suit, recites the fact that that disclaimer has been filed in the Hyde suit, (and that disclaimer is of record in this court), and the final decree further states that the plaintiffs have withdrawn claims 9, 10 and 11 from the Hyde suit; and the fact then appearing in the record in the Hyde suit that a disclaimer has been filed during the suit, the final decree will be without costs. That is the form of the final decree I have handed to defendant's counsel, and I ask that it may be settled now. The

disclaimer is on file in this court; Mr. Walker has it, I believe, and it is now offered for filing. We now file this disclaimer in the Hyde suit.

Mr. Kremer:

To the filing of the disclaimer we object for the reason that the disclaimer itself is not the statutory disclaimer and does not substantially comply with the statute—the statute requiring a disclaimer in whole, and the disclaimer here presented upon its face being only a disclaimer in part; and for the further reason that the disclaimer was not filed within the time or in manner specified or provided by Section 4917 or Section 4922 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; for the particular reason that the plaintiff has been guilty of unreasonable neglect and unreasonable delay in filing the said disclaimer. In connection with this ground I might add as part of the ~~motion~~ ^{objection} that the Supreme Court of the United States, on the 11th day of December, 1916, decided the case of Minerals Separation, Limited, and another, vs. James M. Hyde, and from that time until the 28th day of March, 1917, the complainant failed and neglected and negligently and unreasonably delayed in filing its disclaimer, and this, under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, is not a compliance with the statute so as to take complainant out of the exception of the law, and by failing to file such disclaimer the patent becomes void, and is now void, and they cannot now have a decree entered on something that is entirely void. Under the language of the disclaimer it is a re-issue of the patent they are asking for.

The Court:

Does this section of the patent law cover a mere ambiguity in the specification, a specification true in some particulars, but which may be partly untrue.

Mr. Kremer:

It covers that—the language of the statute is clear. I take it that counsel will agree that if we will consider that the statement of Judge Story is correct, that in the absence of these two sections, 4917 and 4922, the patent would be entirely void, and these sections were enacted solely for the purpose of giving the patentee an opportunity to avoid that which common law has enforced upon him as a penalty, an absolute invalidity, and that would apply in this case, because this disclaimer is not a disclaimer within the meaning of the statute. It is not a penalty imposed on the patentee; it is a benefit that the law extends to him which otherwise he would have been deprived of. But the statutes say to him “You can revise your standing upon the theory that you comply with the terms of this statute,” which we maintain they have not done. So for that reason we object to the filing of the disclaimer, and if the decree is now offered with it, we object to the filing of the decree.

Mr. Williams:

I will hand your honor also the proposed final decree. I wish first to say that as to the question of our delay, the statements that I made as to the date of the issuance of the mandate was exactly true. In the Supreme Court of the United States an opinion is given. The opinion is published for a period of 30 days; during

that period it is open to counsel to make any motion that they seek for a rehearing or a reshaping of the form of the decree, and while the decree of the court is given as of the date of the opinion, (here December 11th, 1916,) and is in the possession of the clerk of the Supreme Court, it is subject to revision or alteration for a period of 30 days, and it absolutely has no force and effect until that period of 30 days has expired; then it becomes a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States, and upon it the mandate is issued, and on January 13th, 1917, this year, the decree in the Hyde case became effective and the mandate issued; so any charge of delay against this British corporation is based upon the fact that three months ago this British corporation was informed that there was a flaw in its patent, and that as the patent existed three of its claims were not in their terms confined to what the Supreme Court said was the invention. The British patentee gave the matter careful and thoughtful consideration, and in fact the disclaimer was filed on March 6, 1917, a little more than two months after the Supreme Court of the United States had finally adjudicated the fact that the patent as it stood, in these three claims, was not confined to the results obtained by the use of a fraction of one per cent of oil.

The Court: Is this the case of a disclaimer?

Mr. Williams: Yes; the patentee in claims 9, 10 and 11 claimed more than he was entitled to.

The Court: The statute says "claims more than he discovered." That is a mere ambiguity. Is that claiming more than he is entitled to under the statute?

Mr. Williams: Yes, sir.

The Court: Has the Supreme Court ever said that?

Mr. Williams: Yes, sir, the Supreme Court has said that in several opinions.

(Argument.)

The Court: In any event the court is bound to enter a decree in conformity with the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States. What effect that will have will be hereafter debated. At this time the disclaimer is ordered filed and it will be allowed to be filed and the decree be signed in accordance with the mandate.

Mr. Kremer: Your honor will permit the noting of an exception upon the record?

The Court: Let the exception be noted.

Mr. Williams: Now, if your honor please, in the case against the Butte & Superior Mining Company—

Mr. Kremer: Before you proceed, we offer an amendment to the answer.

Mr. Williams: We object to the entry of this amendment and —

The Court: Let me hear what the proposed amendment is first.

Mr. Kremer: The amendment sets forth additional patents which the defendant claims anticipate the patent in suit and also sets up certain publications, one of the Daily Herald Democrat—one—the one of importance, the California Journal of Technology; that is the

only one that was not mentioned in the prior answer filed in 1913. This was discovered after the trial of the Hyde case originally, and was a matter that was in evidence and was given consideration in the so-called Miami case. That briefly states the substance of the amendment, although the anticipating patents are enumerated there. I offered them for filing.

Mr. Williams We object to the amendment. The objection is based upon what we shall show. The Butte Superior Mining Company was the actual party defendant in the Hyde suit. It paid all the expenses of that suit; it controlled the conduct of that suit; and in that suit, although with concealment, litigated with the plaintiff the question of the validity of this patent suit. The Butte & Superior Mining Company has therefore had its day in court, and the Butte & Superior Mining Company is bound by the adjudication in the Hyde suit, and no defense additional to what was put forward in the Hyde suit can now, at this late date, be put forward by this defendant, who has already had its day in court. Of course we have not yet brought to your honor the evidence establishing that fact. The evidence has been carefully concealed for some five years, and when it is brought to light, then we maintain that no further defense can be added in this second effort that the Butte & Superior Company is endeavoring to have litigated again, questions that have been litigated to final decision and final decree. We claim of course that these matters are *res adjudicata*. If we establish *res adjudicata*, then further defenses can not be pleaded or considered.

The Court: At this time the admissibility of this

amendment will be held in reserve, and it will be ruled on in plenty of time to give you the benefit of it.

Mr. Williams: There is just one more point that I think perhaps I would like to state here for the record. There is no showing of diligence in the filing of this amendment. The defenses here interposed have been within the knowledge of the defendant for a substantial period of time, and the defendant has not shown the diligence which is required in presenting further defenses.

Mr. Kremer: In that connection you surely do not claim surprise after having these matters litigated in the Miami case for nine weeks; in fact you can not complain of our lack of diligence.

Mr. Garrison: That is an admission that you were in the Miami case; we are very glad to know that.

Mr. Williams: Now, if your honor please, in November, 1913, we first came before your honor in this litigation on a motion for preliminary injunction to restrain the Butte & Superior Mining Company, pending the trial of the suit. The matter was very fully considered by your honor. Affidavits were filed and testimony was taken in open court, and the various questions presented were argued, and your honor found that a case of infringement had been made out, and your honor, in lieu of an injunction, or as a means of saving the defendant from the issuance of an injunction, provided for the filing of monthly reports, and filing of a bond for \$75,000, which now becomes a very insignificant fraction in view of what the monthly reports have shown. We also then presented to your honor, as well as we could with the knowledge that we

then had, the question of *res adjudicata*, and upon the evidence that we then were able to get we did not convince your honor that the Butte & Superior Mining Company was bound by the decree in the Hyde suit; in the course of that proceeding the entire record of the Hyde suit was offered in evidence, and the defendant objected to its offer in evidence unless it should be offered for all purposes, for use at each hearing and for use at the trial, and with the same force and effect as though all the witnesses had testified in the present suit. Thereupon the offer was thus amended and the record in the Hyde suit was put in evidence for all purposes in this suit, and is now a part of the record herein. In that record it appears that James M. Hyde, formerly an employe of the plaintiff, while in the employ of the plaintiff, was directed to go to Butte, Montana, and endeavor to bring about the adoption of the process of this patent by the Butte & Superior Company, which was in difficulty in the treatment of its ore; and our trusted employee, Mr. Hyde, replied by stating that his contract with us had nearly expired, and that he would go to London; and instead of going to Butte he came to London and severed his connection with the company. Shortly thereafter—he severed his connection in February or March, 1911—shortly thereafter he came to the United States—came to Butte, Montana, came to the defendant, Butte & Superior Mining Company, offered to them the knowledge that he had acquired and the training that he had received from us, notwithstanding the fact that our representative was here and requesting the Butte & Superior Company to take a license; succeeded in prevailing

upon the Butte & Superior Company to make a contract with him or to permit him to install the infringing process, which was installed, as he states, in August, 1911, and which has been used by the Butte & Superior Mining Company since that time with great profit to itself, in defiance of the patent. In that suit it appeared that when this defendant, James M. Hyde, was asked who was paying the expense of the other suit, he put forward that beautiful explanation—I am paying the expense of this suit with the proceeds of the sale to the Butte & Superior Company of an exclusive license in the Butte district under my patent—which was issued some time after the suit was commenced. The great expense of that litigation, a wholly uncertain quantity, according to Hyde, was to be paid out—not by the company—but by him. That was the consideration for the transfer to the company of this extremely restricted interest in a certain patent that James M. Hyde claimed to have. We proved in that case that this patent was a sham and a fraud; that it was founded on two things, one of which he had learned while in our employ, and the other was a known fact before. It was a perfectly worthless patent. The evidence shows it.

We shall prove, if it is possible to do so—if it is possible to bring out from concealment the real facts of the relations of James M. Hyde with the Butte & Superior Company—that the first installation, which Hyde in that suit admitted was his—was in fact erected with the funds of the Butte & Superior Company at the plant of the Butte & Superior Company, operated

by the Butte & Superior Company, and that Hyde was a mere salaried employe of the Butte & Superior Company, with possibly some contingent interest coming to him in the event of success. We do not know all the facts which we shall try to bring out.

Now, the questions at issue have been litigated—litigated to the end. The Supreme Court of the United States has spoken. There is just one new point of law in this case. There can be no new defenses, because that litigation is over. There can be no attack upon the validity of the patent, because that has been adjudged. But there is the new point of law, and that is the point of law which arises as to the disclaimer. Before the Supreme Court of the United States, claims 9, 10 and 11 as they existed in the patent, included within their scope too much. There was not a word in that specification from beginning to end up to the claims that was in the slightest degree objectionable or capable of criticism. The disclosure of the invention was complete and claims 1 to 8 and 12 were claims which were each one limited within the scope of that invention, but in these claims 9, 10 and 11 the patentees had not put the definite limitations to the invention that they disclosed and claimed in the other claims, and so the Supreme Court held that these three claims were in doubt: the patent must be restricted, and the plaintiff, giving the matter the mature thought and consideration, decided that under the law the proper way to restrict it and to be within the letter and substance of the Supreme Court decision was to file a formal disclaimer, which has been filed; and of course that is a new ques-

tion of law remaining for adjudication in this case, apparently raising only the question as to whether or not the limitation that has been imposed upon the scope of those claims by that disclaimer has now validated those claims within those limitations.

The Court: Is it a case where a disclaimer is necessary? The court will take the liberty of doubting it until I hear you further—as limited by your disclaimer are they in addition to your other claims?

Mr. Williams: We think they were not exactly proper, and that is why we filed the disclaimer. It was a question for serious consideration. It seemed to us that a claim which said that you put in ore pulp an amount of oil which is a fraction of one per cent, might not—although it could be by the doctrine of equivalents—might not possibly be construed as applying to a condition of things wherein the defendants did put into the ore pulp an amount of material which might be called an oil, in a proportion that was slightly greater than a fraction of one per cent, and they might obtain the results which for the first time were obtained by the process of the patent in suit; and it seemed to us that we would be in a better position in maintaining our rights to the invention which the Supreme Court gave us, if we validated those claims, by limiting their scope so as not to have the mathematical foot rule definition, but that definition which the Supreme Court expressed, “the results obtained by the use of oil amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore,” and that is why we did it that way.

I may say that we also felt convinced that had we

filed a disclaimer on these claims in toto, the defendant would come to this court and say—"Why, those plaintiffs, by their affirmative act, have disclaimed any process wherein there is put into the ore pulp any quantity of oil exceeding a fraction of one per cent; they have done it affirmatively and they can not by any possibility—ask for the application of the doctrine of equivalents—the remaining claims must be limited to the measurements expressed in them"—those are the considerations that led us to take this step; so that we come to this court with claims 9, 10 and 11 validated by the disclaimer of that part of their scope wherein the Supreme Court said they were broader than that to which they should be confined.

Now, if your honor please, this proceeding—this trial—is upon the pleadings, and for the purpose of this trial and for the purpose of the interlocutory decree, which is the only decree which can follow this trial should the decree be for the plaintiff—we have only to prove, and we shall submit to the court as the only consideration that is pertinent, that after the issuance of this patent, during the existence of this patent and before the commencement of this suit, the defendant performed an act of infringement. Having proved that the defendant in that period performed an act of infringement, we have established our right to the interlocutory decree, which directs the injunction and which directs the accounting, which within your honor's discretion may be referred to a master in whole or in part, a matter that will be considered when we get to that part of the trial.

Now, for the purpose of the issues here involved, or the interlocutory decree which we ask at this trial, we have a remedy.

P. 2211, L. 4, insert after "claims", "*res adjudicata*, and will try to prove it, the plaintiff claims"

... have not had time to get together this morning, but it is understood—and we also have depositions that were taken.

The Court: The stipulation covering the infringement?

Mr. Williams: Covering the acts of which we complain.

Mr. Kremer: As to the amount of oil.

The Court: I see.

Mr. Williams: In addition thereto we took some testimony, which was by depositions, nearly three years ago, based upon examination and assay of a specimen of the concentrates of the Butte & Superior Mining Company, which were obtained from a car at Oklahoma, and the stipulation will identify those concentrates as concentrates obtained by the defendant at its flotation plant; the evidence already taken by deposition will be filed, and from our view point—there is of course the question of law as to whether or not those acts of the defendant are acts of infringement, and as to that, of course, the Hyde decision will control; that seems to the plaintiff as the whole case that is before the court, up to the point of the interlocutory decree.

Now, that completes my opening, and I presume it is unnecessary to note that the record in the Hyde case

is offered in evidence, but if it be necessary it is noted here that the entire record in the Hyde suit is offered in evidence.

Mr. Kremer: The record in this court?

Mr. Williams: Yes; that being of record in this court. Then the mandate, the decree and mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Hyde case are also offered in evidence. It so happens that those documents are in Helena this morning, but the defendant is fully advised as to them. The mandate itself and a copy of the decree of the Supreme Court annexed to the mandate, happen to be in Helena this morning. They are offered in evidence, however.

Mr. Kremer: We have no objection; they may be offered at this time.

Mr. Williams: The disclaimer of March 28, 1917, is offered in evidence by a certified copy thereof.

Mr. Kremer: To which also we object for the reason that the purported disclaimer is no disclaimer in point of law, for the reason that the disclaimer, in its very language, discloses the fact that the complainant disclaims nothing; that there is no relinquishment of any purported right to claims 9, 10 and 11 embodied in said disclaimer; that the only attempted relinquishment of said claims is covered by the statement as follows: "Excepting where the results obtained are the results obtained by the use of oil in a quantity amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore," by such exception the plaintiff nullifying all previous attempts at disclaimer, making the disclaimer mean nothing and not yielding to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that said claims were invalid in toto.

For the further reason that the said disclaimer was not filed until the 28th day of March, 1917, and the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hyde case, holding claims 9, 10 and 11 of the patent invalid, was rendered on the 11th day of December, 1916, and, under the statement of counsel here made in court, the date just mentioned is correct; and the mandate upon which he seeks to avoid unreasonable delay was issued on the 13th day of January, 1917, 74 days before the filing of the disclaimer.

For the further reason that, taking the notice and not the process of the court, which was chargeable to the complainant, therefore the date would be as of December 11th, 1917, and, by reason of the foregoing the complainant has been guilty of an unreasonable neglect and delay in the filing of the said disclaimer within the meaning of Sections 4917 and 4922 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

For the additional reason that it is the law of the land, the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, that said disclaimer must be filed immediately upon the rendition of the decision by the highest court in the land, that being the highest court in the land.

Now, if your honor pleases, we are prepared to argue this case, if your honor desires to hear argument upon it at this time. Shall we proceed?

The Court: Yes.

Mr. Kremer: At the outset, if your honor pleases, without indulging to a protracted degree into the his-

tory of patent law, it would be well to observe that the statutes protect the right of the patentee.

I suppose you take the position that the patent in suit was offered in the Hyde case, and it is therefore in this case.

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Kremer: That is the position I take.

As I started to observe, the statutes perfecting the rights of the patentee are very few, and the law with reference to his rights and the limitations upon his rights is exceedingly simple, as is oftentimes observed in a discussion of the historical facts surrounding the law of patents.

The right to a patent had its origin in the giving of grants to favored courtiers, to the bestowal of exclusive rights to certain favorite courtiers, and in that manner the question of monopoly first received attention, followed by ultimate resentment from the people who were oppressed by the king's prerogative of granting to one man that which no other man should enjoy. That was the origin of patents. The holder of the monopoly at that time occupied no other position than the holder of a patent today, shorn of the restrictions which the law places about monopolies and patent rights. This condition became so distasteful that it resulted in the enactment by parliament of the Act of Monopolies, which I believe was in 1623. This was followed by judicial interpretation. One exception alone was made to the Act of Monopolies and that was where one had invented or had from his own brain

conceived that which was a benefit to the nation, he, to a limited extent, should enjoy the fruits of his own ingenuity. And it was upon that that the patent law of today was based. In this country the rights of patentees rest almost exclusively upon the power granted by the Constitution to Congress and the enactments of Congress.

Now, it is hardly necessary for me to observe that judicial interpretation instead of being of a liberal scope, as has been indicated by counsel in his opening statement, has been zealous of these public rights. It has restricted the rights of the patentee, and only recently, within the week, the Supreme Court of the United States has thrown additional restrictions about the so-called rights of patentees and has announced the rule that, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther," because you enjoy that under the guise of law to which you would have no natural or just rights if it were not for the operation of the law. Now, with this in mind, let us approach directly the question before the court.

If it were not for the enactment of Section 4917 and Section 4922 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, the patent in suit, or any patent, any part of the claims of which had been held invalid, would be void, and of no force or effect. I take it there can be no dispute and will be no dispute between counsel in this case as to that being the rule of law. The reason for that is based upon that which counsel perfectly expressed in the pleadings of this case, insofar as it applies to the common law defense. And this portion

of the answer rests on a paragraph, the rule of the common law as to the validity of the patent contained in paragraph 3 upon page 18 of the original answer: "This defendant avers that for the purpose of deceiving the public the description and specifications filed by the said patentees in the Patent Office was in some particulars made to contain more than the whole truth relative to their alleged invention or discovery and more than is necessary to produce the desired effects, and that in other particulars the said description and specification was made to contain less than the whole truth relative to their alleged invention and discovery." And, upon that state of facts, at common law, a patent was held to be invalid in toto. If there was one invalid claim the patent failed by reason of the defect in structure. Why? It was a safeguard to the rights of the public, because if that were not true—and I am attempting at this particular time to address my remarks somewhat to the inquiry propounded by your honor to counsel when we were discussing the entering of the decree in the Hyde case—because if that were not true ^{and} there were 18 claims in a patent and 17 of them were invalid and only one valid, the claimant could then go on and hold himself out to the public under the guise of having a patent issued in his name, under the guise of a claim of right, and thereby deceive the public and prevent the public from the ultimate enjoyment of something that might be of great public weal. It is to safeguard the public that this rule of law exists. Therefore the same rule exists with reference to the statement of 18 claims where

there is one invalid claim as exists as to the statement of 18 claims where there are 17 invalid claims. There is no distinction.

Now, I take for granted that counsel will admit, and if they do not, then the question can be speedily and readily disproved by the slightest examination of the authorities, that in the absence of these two remedial statutes this patent in suit would be entirely void. I use the words "remedial statute" because counsel has declared to the court in his very able explanation of the patent law, that these are remedial statutes and thoroughly remedial statutes.

Now that brings us to this question: First, is it necessary for the complainant in this case to comply with these sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States in order to save its patent from entire invalidity? Second, is the disclaimer here on file in law a disclaimer?

I shall take up the first question and at the outset I desire to call the court's attention, although it does not appear as the first case cited in the brief which I hold in my hand, the case which I believe can well be considered the leading case upon this subject, the case of *O'Reilly vs. Morse*, 15 How. 62, 14 Law Ed. 609. And before discussing that question I desire to refer to the statement made by counsel in his opening argument that some of the courts have held that six months is not too long, six months is not an unreasonable delay under certain conditions. I challenge counsel to show that such a condition ever existed whereby the court gave it that consideration where there had been a de-

cision by the Supreme Court of the United States. Your honor will find upon an examination of the authorities that the courts have held that four weeks, two weeks, ten days or 45 days—I think that is the maximum I have seen—is not an unreasonable delay because the invalidity of the patent or the invalidity of the claim of the patent had not been adjudged by the highest court in the land. The converse of that reasoning then must be that if the highest court in the land had decreed the invalidity of the claim of this patent then that length of time would have been an unreasonable delay. There can be no answer to that logic. Therefore we are then confronted with this situation: that if the highest court in the land has decreed the patent invalid then this is the final word, and it is incumbent upon a claimant to no longer deceive the public by holding himself out to the world as the owner of a claim that the Supreme Court has said he does not possess. Therefore, I take it, and I believe, that he must move expeditiously, because with that decision his rights terminated and any act of his subsequent to that time is an infringement upon the rights of the public and a direct violation of the law of the decision, in view of the fact that he is encroaching upon the limitations of the monopoly.

Now, referring to the case of O'Reilly vs. Morse, the court said in part: "The law which requires and permits him to disclaim is not penal, but remedial." The law which *permits* him to disclaim is remedial. "It is intended for the protection of the patentee, as well as the public, and ought not therefore to receive a

construction that would restrict its operations within narrower limits than its words fairly import. It provides, 'when any patentee shall have in his specification claimed to be the first and original inventor and discoverer of any material, or substantial part of the thing patented, of which he was not the first and original inventor, and shall have no legal or just claim to the same,' he must disclaim in order to protect so much of the claim as is legally patented.' " I think, if your honor please, that that paragraph answers very completely the inquiry that you propounded to opposing counsel this morning. " 'Whether, therefore, the patent is illegal in part because he claims more than he has sufficiently described, or more than he invented, he must in either case disclaim, in order to save the portion to which he is entitled, and he is allowed to do so when the error was committed by mistake.'

" 'A different construction would be unjust to the public, as well as to the patentee, and defeat the manifest object of the law, and produce the very evil against which it intended to guard.

" 'It appears that no disclaimer has yet been entered, at the patent office; but the delay in entering it is not unreasonable, or the objectionable claim was sanctioned by the head of the office, it has been held to be valid by a circuit court, and difference of opinion in relation are found to exist among the justices of this court. *Under such circumstances the patentee had a right to insist upon it, and not disclaim it until the highest court to which it could be carried had*

pronounced its judgment.'” And that has been done in this case; has been long since.

“The omission to disclaim, therefore, does not render the patent altogether void, and he is entitled to proceed in this suit for an infringement of that part of his invention which is legally claimed and described. But, as no disclaimer was entered in the patent office before this suit was instituted, he cannot, under the Act of Congress, be allowed costs against the wrongdoers, although the infringement should be proved.’”

Therefore that decision in the O'Reilly case holds that when the highest court of the land had pronounced invalid the claim of a patent the disclaimer must be filed without unreasonable delay; and that unreasonable delay certainly falls within a limitation no less than the time in the suit at bar.

Again, your honor, referring to the question of claims in the case of Seymour v. McCormick, 60 U. S. page 96; 15 Law Ed. 557, the Supreme Court in discussing the rule said “It is said by the learned counsel of the defendant, that there is a claim in the patent outside of the two claims that are in controversy, which is void, because McCormick appears, from the evidence, not to have been the original and first inventor and that inasmuch as he had made one void claim his patent is void, as it respects all the other claims. Although the evidence may show that he was the original and first inventor of all these other claims, as regards the law applicable to this point, the learned counsel is not strictly correct. The law is this:

if a patentee makes a claim which is not well founded in the same patent with other claims which are well founded, he may disclaim, within a reasonable time that which he had no right to claim, and then his patent will be good as to the residue—as good as if it had originally issued only for claims which are valid. If he omits to make a disclaimer, but brings a suit for the violation of his patent, and it satisfactorily appears upon the trial that he is entitled to be protected in a portion of the claim set up in his patent, but that he is not entitled to be protected in respect to another portion, he is still entitled to damages for a violation of the valid portion of his claim, the same as if all the claims were valid, so far as regards the mere right of recovery, but he gets no cost. That is the law. It has this qualification: if the jury are satisfied that there has been unreasonable negligence and delay on the part of the patentee, in making a disclaimer as respect the invalid part of his patent, then the whole patent is inoperative, and the verdict must be for the defendant, as in this case the claim on which the question arises is as follows: ”

And it goes on. That was a case for damages, tried before a jury and this was said in discussing an instruction given to the jury, but of necessity that same principle applies in actions at law as maintains in a suit in equity. The O'Reilly Morse case is cited to the same effect, and *Silsby v. Foote*, 61 U. S. 377-378.

I will say to the court in passing that I have found no rule contrary to these decisions to which I have just referred: I have endeavored to select what I con-

sider the best considered and so-called leading cases upon this subject, trying to use the Supreme Court of the United States decisions in all instances, and I believe I have done so in all save one, the case to which I will refer in closing. In the case of *Silsby v. Foote*, and I desire to call your honor's attention to the strong dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Grier, in which dissenting opinion Justice Grier discussed this question of disclaimer.

It has been suggested by Mr. Sheridan that ~~both~~ the majority decision as well as the dissenting opinion agree upon the facts in the case, and that there exists only a difference of opinion in connection with the limitation that should be placed upon the time of filing of the disclaimer. I direct your honor's attention to that case. It is not at all opposed to any case here cited, but, on the contrary, very strongly upholds the uniformity of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on this question.

Smith v. Nichols, 88 U. S. 112, 22 Law Ed. 566 is another case dealing substantially with the same question.

In a very recent case the court in speaking of the matter of disclaimer, spoke as follows:—this was a case in which one of the distinguished gentlemen appearing upon the other side appeared—*Motion Picture Patents Co. vs. Laemmle and others*, 214 Fed. 796. I think Mr. Kenyon was of counsel in that case. The court in the discussion of this question of disclaimer says, "It was quite natural that the valuable additional rights thus conferred by the disclaimer act

sections should be surrounded with substantial safeguards, and the Congress determined that the patentee should not eat his cake and have it too." A very homely way of expressing it, but at the same time a very forcible way. "Therefore, it was provided among other things, that no patentee should be 'entitled to the benefits of this section' if he 'unreasonably neglected or delayed' to enter a disclaimer. 'The benefit of this section' undoubtedly mean the right to 'maintain a suit at law or in equity for the infringement of any part thereof.' (Meaning 'the thing patented') 'which was bona fide his own.'

"There has been a good deal of discussion as to what would constitute unreasonable neglect or delay so as to deprive a patentee of the benefits of the disclaimer section, and, when appeals in patent cases went direct to the Supreme Court, it was held that the delay until the Supreme Court had finally passed on the validity of the claim was not unreasonable. *O'Reilly v. Morse*, 15 How. 62, 120; *Seymour v. McCormick*; *Gage v. Herring*" cited by the court.

"It is urged by counsel for complainant that since the creation of the Circuit Courts of Appeals by the so-called Evarts Act, a delay to disclaim cannot be held unreasonable until the patentee has first exhausted every effort to reach the Supreme Court of the United States. Such efforts have not infrequently involved the litigating of the validity of a patent, in even more than two Circuits, as was instanced in the *Grant Tire Case*, which was held invalid by the court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, 116 Fed. 363, and

again by the ~~C~~ourt of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and later came before the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which held the patent valid. (Consolidated Rubber Tire Company vs. Firestone Tire & Rubber Company, 151 Fed. 237, 80 C. C. A. 589), and finally reached the Supreme Court by certiorari, where the decision sustaining the patent was affirmed (Diamond Rubber Company v. Consol. Tire Company, 220 U. S. 428"—) citing a number of cases. As I said, this case is reported in 214 Fed. That is ~~the~~ perhaps the latest decision of any court on this very important question of disclaimer, and in this opinion the district judge, I believe, has embraced the better considered decisions, showing the uniformity of law in connection with this matter of disclaimer.

So, if your honor pleases, without prolonging this discussion by the citation of additional authorities, which would no more than bear out the statement of the law as embraced particularly in the O'Reilly-Morse decision, as well as the Silsby-Foote decision and the Seymour-McCormick case, I believe that we can rest upon the statements that we made in the beginning, it being borne out by the decisions that in order to save their patent from complete annihilation, so to speak, it is incumbent upon them to disclaim these claims that the Supreme Court held to be invalid and that by failing to disclaim they have imposed upon the public to the extent of holding themselves out as the owners of a monopoly upon a process embraced within these claims 9, 10, and 11, when they in fact do not own it.

Now, that brings me to the disclaimer itself. As

has been called to your honor's attention, they say, "We disclaim 9, 10, and 11, but we want to keep this much of it." If these claims are invalid, as the Supreme Court has said they are invalid in toto, there is no part of it that you can separate. What they do attempt to do in this disclaimer, if your honor please, is to ask this court to reissue this patent, and by so doing they ask this court to do that which it is powerless to do. Now, they say we disclaim 9, 10, and 11 except where the results obtained are the results obtained by the use of oil in quantity amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore. I tried to understand the excuse presented to the court this morning for this character of disclaimer, but I could not. I am perfectly willing, however, to attribute that to my own lack of intelligence rather than to the clearness of explanation by Mr. Williams. But, be that as it may, the request here is a request for a reissuance of this patent; and from the date of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on December 11, 1916, to this very hour, there is no disclaimer within the law in the patent office or in this court or anywhere else. This is not a disclaimer. To use the homely language that I referred to but the expressive language, of the distinguished judge who decided the Motion Picture case, they are endeavoring to eat their cake and have it too.

And, as has thus been suggested, there is no foundation in the body of any specification for any claim as that here attempted to be made in that disclaimer. So, if your honor pleases, it takes but a perusal of this

paper, so-called disclaimer for your honor to determine that they are now saying, "We waive it, but we wish to hold a part of it." Now, by taking that paper by the four corners and examining it briefly, they must purge themselves of their deception in the manner which the law imposes by a renunciation of these invalid claims; they must come in and say in the very language of the court that declared them invalid, "we relinquish all rights to claims 9, 10, and 11, in order that we may enjoy the fruits of that which this court has decreed to be good," and until they do that, they have no place in a court of law, much less in a court of equity. Even if it were not for the rule of law which so clearly demands a compliance with these provisions, in equity and good conscience, they could not be heard to come into a court of equity asking equitable relief unless they approach the Chancellor with clean hands, which the maximum of equity demands. But here is a statute which limits their right, it gives them an opportunity to save something if they do a certain thing. It carries with that the forfeiture of all that they might claim if they refuse to do it. In the case of *National v. Stecher*, 81 Fed. 395, the following was held; where the limitation or requirement of the disclaimer pertains to an invention which would require an amended specification, a disclaimer is not the proper method. It means a reissue, and that is exactly what they have asked here and they cannot obtain that relief here. So we submit this question to the court with full confidence that we have come well within the rule of law in this objection, and we believe that the

decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States upon this all important question, without the shadow of a doubt, upheld the position here taken by us and that in view of that condition and in view of the fact that up to this hour they have not filed a disclaimer but tenaciously cling to that which the Supreme Court has said they were not entitled to, we maintain that in the light of these combined conditions we are entitled at this time to have this objection sustained and this patent declared invalid by reason of the fact they have shown by their actions that they do not believe that their rights are amenable to the plain provisions of the law.

MR. KENYON: I did not anticipate that this disclaimer question would be argued at this time and haven't all my authorities at hand, but can present them in a memorandum without much delay, and can present now an outline of what they show.

I was not concerned in the Motion Pictures case against Laemelle to which Mr. Kremer referred but I was engaged in prior litigation between the same parties where a disclaimer question arose. The particular question to which Mr. Kremer refers—the particular case to which Mr. Kremer refers was brought after a reissue had been taken of the Edison Motion Picture Camera patent. Prior to the taking of this reissue, litigation through two or three years, of a very strenuous character, proceeded upon the unreissued patent up—it had previously been reissued for another purpose—and there the defense was unreasonable neglect and delay in filing a disclaimer, and

the delay there had been four years and a half after the Circuit Court of Appeals in New York had a second time held a certain claim 4 invalid and too broad and certain other claims valid and not too broad. The plaintiff, after that decision, in 1907, had gone forward and enforced the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals as to the validity of claims 1, 2 and 3, taking advantage of it created a monopoly of the motion picture business under claims 1, 2 and 3 of that patent, and doing nothing as to the claim 4 that had been decreed invalid by that Circuit Court of Appeals once in 1902 and again in 1907. And I will say that on both occasions, in 1902 and in 1907, petition for a writ of certiorari had been made to the Supreme Court from the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals and had been denied. So that that decision, as to claim 4 being invalid in that litigation, stood as the last holding of the highest court to which the case could go. And in *Motion Pictures Company against Yankee Company*, (187 Fed. 1007) we stood upon that defense of unreasonable neglect or delay as a defense to a motion for a preliminary injunction upon claims 1, 2 and 3 which had been held valid, the invalid claim 4 was not there in suit. The Circuit Court of Appeals denied the motion for injunction because there was so much doubt on the question whether the delay of four and a half years had been too long. The plaintiff argued in that case that it was not too long and the court was in doubt whether four and a half years was too long, but it denied the motion for the preliminary injunction, expressing its doubt, whereupon the plain-

tiff reissued, striking out that claim 4, substituting for it a corresponding claim 4 limited as claim 1, 2 and 3 had been, and adding another claim 5 as to some other details, and it was then subsequently so reissued with that same restricted claim four as well as claims 1, 2 3 and 5. The judge held that the reissue was good, whatever the doubt about there having been previously an unreasonable neglect or delay in filing a disclaimer. But no one in that whole litigation from beginning to end pretended that a delay of a few months would have constituted unreasonable delay or that anything other than this long interval of four or four and a half years during which time the plaintiff was enforcing by countless suits and motions for preliminary injunction the claims 1, 2 and 3,—that part of the decision of the court that had been favorable,—and had treated with contempt, the part of the decision of the court that had been unfavorable.

Now, on this general question of unreasonable neglect or delay, I have, I think, studied every case that has ever turned upon that question or discussed it from any point of view, and I have yet to know a single instance of a patent having been declared invalid because of unreasonable neglect or delay in filing disclaimer.

In *Mason v. Bushnell*, 96 Fed. 238, where the delay was from May when the court spoke—it was there a Circuit Court of Appeals—to July when the disclaimer was filed, although the argument was made that that was too great a delay the court brushed it aside with impatience. “There is no force—” said Judge La-

combe, speaking for the Circuit Court of Appeals in the Second District—"in the contention that there has been any unreasonable delay in filing the disclaimer. Defendant insists that the owners of the patent should have realized the necessity of so doing when the evidence as to prior use of a narrow tempered slip in circular saws and back saws was introduced in the Jennings case. (November 28th, 1902). But the Circuit Court in that case, with such evidence before it, did not consider disclaimer necessary. It was only when the decision of this court was filed, May 28th, 1915, that the owners of the patent were apprised of the necessity of disclaimer, and they filed it in July, 1915. They certainly acted with reasonable promptness."

I will call to your attention other illustrations of delay of that sort, from a month, three months, six months—I haven't them here at the minute—where the courts have brushed aside the suggestion that the delay was unreasonable. Courts, under such circumstances, take the reasonable view that in matters of such importance as a disclaimer, counsel and the parties are entitled to do the thing deliberately, to do the thing with care, with thoughtfulness, with consultation, with re-consultation before the act is done. Because what is a disclaimer? It is a surrender for all time, irrevocable by the party interested, beyond the power of any court in the land to recall to him, irrevocable beyond any power of the land except that of Congress to reinstate him with what he has by that act dedicated to the public. It is the most solemn sort

of a dedication of something to the public which he can never recall, which he can never thereafter contend in any litigation belongs to him. It has gone into the public domain by that solemn act of his of filing at Washington a disclaimer notifying all the public that they are free to use the thing disclaimed, so far as he is concerned, and so far as that patent is concerned. A reasonable man, when the property is of value and importance, a reasonable man would take time to consult one counsel, and to consult another counsel and to consult associates across the water, if there those associates lived. They have the right to take reasonable time before taking such a step as that. Now, we do not know whether the defendant in the Hyde case is going to petition to the Supreme Court for rehearing of that case or not. The defendant in the Hyde case has the right to file with the Supreme Court at Washington a petition for rehearing of that whole case.

THE COURT: How long?

MR. KENYON: Up to next October.

THE COURT: You have the same right?

MR. KENYON: We have the same right; until we disclaimed this overplus of claims 9, 10 and 11, we had the same right until next October to file a petition in the Supreme Court to review and rehear that part of their decision and mandate which refers to claims 9, 10 and 11. I say that time cannot possibly, in the strictest legal interpretation or in equity, that time cannot have begun to run against us until the expiration of that right of ours, which would be the last day of September of 1917. Now, what harm has come,

because of our delay of 74 days of pondering; what harm has been occasioned, to anybody? Mr. Kremer suggested that we have by not disclaiming been continuing to assert claims 9, 10 and 11. I take issue with him there. We have not asserted these claims against anyone; we have not filed a bill of complaint against anybody alleging infringement of these invalid claims since the Supreme Court pronounced them invalid. We have not taken a step in any litigation where that position has been asserted. We have not asserted that in literature; we have not asserted that against the trade. We have taken, deliberately and carefully, time enough to consider what the Supreme Court decision means because that was the first great question we had to decide. What did it mean? What were our rights and privileges under the law, in view of that decision? It was then our duty to consider the form that our disclaimer should take and to consult with all of those whose property it was. And, above all, we had to decide whether to go back to the Supreme Court with a petition for a rehearing and ask them to change that part of their holding. That was an important matter and a difficult matter for us to decide; and the opinion of the Supreme Court is expressed in such a way that we have had real difficulty in understanding what it really meant and what duties and obligations it really placed upon us. Has the defendant, by reason of this delay, during this period of 74 days, done anything it would not have done if we had earlier filed a disclaimer? There is no evidence or suggestion of anything of the kind. The suggestion

that we have unreasonably neglected or delayed to file this document should be brushed aside as unworthy of consideration. It has not a consideration of substance supporting it; of equity supporting it, of common sense supporting it.

Men, in the great affairs of life, do not act overnight. They cannot act within a week. They may well delay a month. They may well delay three months. That time came out of the term of our patent. It cost us something but it cost the defendant nothing. In no way has it harmed the defendant.

Now, on the question of the proper nature and character of this disclaimer. It is the sort of disclaimer that is within the exact purpose and function of the law and the rule of law in its remedial enactment, that where a patent covers more than it ought to cover and that more can be eliminated by simply cutting off, then the patentee, by filing a solemn document at Washington called disclaimer, cutting all overplus off, may make his patent good ~~and keep~~ for the residue for what is left, enabling him to sue for infringement one who infringes what is left, and not abating any suits previously begun, but affecting them only in the matter of costs, the disclaimer inuring to the benefit of the suit, in the middle, at the end, at the beginning, anywhere in the pending litigation, and benefitting the plaintiff in future litigation just to the extent that it validates his patent for what is really his invention, disclaiming only an overplus or what is not his invention. The statute says nothing about claims. The disclaimer statutes say nothing about claims. It only

knows what the patent covers and includes and it is as applicable to a patent with only one claim as it is to a patent with one hundred claims in it.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until 2:00 o'clock P. M., Monday, April 16th, 1917.

2 o'clock P. M.

MR. KENYON: (Continuing) If your honor please I have now my fuller notes with me on the cases on this subject. I will first quote from the case *Carnegie Steel Co. vs. Cambria Co.*, 46 L. Ed. 968, at 985; 1901, Justice Brown.

"Upon the hearing defendant seems to have insisted that certain portions of the specifications were broader than the second claim. Those parts of the specifications therefore were disclaimed. As we had occasion to observe in *Sessions vs. Romacka*, 145 U. S. 29, 36 L. Ed. 609, 12 Sup. Ct. Rep., 799, 'the power to disclaim is a beneficial one, and ought not to be denied except where it is resorted to for a fraudulent and deceptive purpose.' In that case the plaintiff was permitted to enter a disclaimer of all the claims but one in suit, the patentee having included in the patent more devices than properly could be the subject of a single patent. In the case under consideration the disclaimer was not of a claim, but of certain statements in the specification, which if retained might be construed to have the effect of illegally broadening the second claim. The first statement disclaimed was that the invention

might be practiced by *merely* receiving a number of small portions of metal taken from different ladles, the mixing being performed *merely* by the act of pouring into the charging ladle. The use of the word 'merely' ignored the steps embodied in the second claim, where the mixing is not performed by merely pouring together the several charges into a ladle, but by maintaining a permanent quantity of metal in the reservoir, into which charges were alternately added and from which they were withdrawn. The other clauses were intended to disclaim the casting of the metal into pigs. We think there is no force in the criticism that a disclaimer may not extend to a part of the specification, as well as to a distinct claim. *Hurlbut v. Schillinger*, 130 U. S., 456, 32 L. Ed. 1011, 9th Sup. Ct. Rep. 584; *Schillinger v. Gunther*, 17 Blatchf., Fed. Cas. No. 12458; *Schwartzwalder v. New York Filter Co.*, 13 C. C. A. 380, 26 U. S. App. 547, 66 Fed. 152. Had the purpose of the disclaimer been to reform or alter the description of the invention, or convert the claim from one thing into something else, it might have been objectionable, as patents can only be amended for mistakes of this kind by a re-issue. But the disclaimer in this case appears to have been made to obviate an ambiguity in the specification, and with no idea of obtaining the benefits of a re-issue. If the clauses had the effect of broadening the patent the disclaimer removes the objection. If they did not, the disclaimer could do no harm, and can not be made the subject of criticism."

I will also refer to *Tuck v. Bramhill*, 3d Fish. Pat.

cases, 400, Fed. Cas. 14213, and *Taylor v. Archer*, 4 Fish. Pat. Cas. 449, Fed. Cas. 13778.

I note that in *Carnegie v. Cambria Iron Wks.*, there was this situation, that the claim might have a broad or a narrow scope. The broad scope was too broad, the narrower scope covered the real invention. This language in the specification left it in doubt whether the claim covered the broad field or the narrower field. The patentee filed a disclaimer, thereby himself asserting and admitting the narrow scope by disclaiming anything over and above the actual invention. I have the form of that disclaimer here. After the formal part it says: "Enter this disclaimer to those parts of the specification which are in the following words, which your petitioner desires to erase from the specification," then it enumerates—"or the metal is cast into pigs or otherwise used." That is all of the disclaimer, and it did not change a word in the claim, but it took out of the specification matters that might have compelled the court, in construing the claim, to hold it and construe it as of a broader field than the real invention, and therefore wholly invalid.

Now, in *Tuck v. Bramhill*, 6 Blatchf., 95, after the testimony on both sides had been put in before the examiner, the plaintiff filed a disclaimer setting forth that he was the owner of the patent, and making his disclaimer, "to that part of the claim which covers the packing therein described without a core," thereby causing the claim to include only the packing formed out of saturated canvas, so cut as that the thread or warp shall run in a diagonal direction from the

line or center of the roll of packing, and rolled into form in connection with and around an India rubber core, or one of other elastic material, meaning the said claim to include only the combination of an elastic core, with saturated canvas, having threads running in a diagonal direction, as described in said patent, wound around the same." The court says: "It having been shown that the forming of the roll in the manner described, without the core, was old, the next question is whether the plaintiff could disclaim, as he

to do the forming of the roll without the

P. 2237, L. 12, insert after "core", "and limit to the forming of the roll with the core"

claims more than that of which the patentee is the original or first inventor; but the disclaimer can not be made unless some material and substantial part of the thing patented is truly and justly the invention of the patentee, and, in such case, he is authorized to make disclaimer of such parts of the thing patented as he does not claim to hold by virtue of the patent. The defendant contends, that the claim of this patent is not equivalent to two claims, and that, therefore, under the statute, the patentee has no right to disclaim anything in the claim. But this objection has been already disposed of. The forming of the roll within the core is one material and substantial part of the thing patented. The forming of the roll with the core is another material and substantial part of the thing patented.

"The patentee was not the first inventor of the for-

mer; he was the first inventor of the latter. The two are clearly separable and distinguishable. The claim is too broad, and claims more than that of which the patentee was the first inventor. A clear case, therefore, existed, under the 7th Section of the Act of March 3d, 1837, for a disclaimer by the patentee of so much of his claim as covered the forming of the roll without the core. The disclaimer goes exactly to that extent. It disclaims that part of the claim 'which covered the packing therein described without a core;' and then it goes on to state what the claim will be after such disclaimer, namely, that it will 'include only the packing formed out of saturated canvas, so cut that the thread or warp will run in a diagonal direction from the line or center of the roll or packing, and rolled into form in connection with and around an India rubber core, or one composed of other elastic material', and that it will 'include only the combination of an elastic core with saturated canvas having threads running in a diagonal direction as described in the said patent, wound around the same.' This disclaimer is unambiguous, and leaves the claim as if it had originally claimed only such combination. It is substantially just such a disclaimer as the Supreme Court, in *Silsby v. Foote*, 14 Howard, 218, 221, held to be valid. The claim there was to 'the application of the expansive and contracting power of a metallic rod, by different degrees of heat, to open and close a damper, which governs the admission of air into a stove, or other structure, in which it may be used, by which a more perfect control over the heat is obtained than can be

by a damper in the flue.' It having been shown that the application of the expansive and contracting power of a metallic rod, by different degrees of heat, to regulate the heat of other structures than a stove in which the rod was acted upon directly by the heat of the stove, or the fire which it contained, was not new with the patentee, he entered a disclaimer 'to so much of said claim as extends the application of the expansive and contracting power of a metallic rod by different degrees of heat, to ~~say~~ any other use or purpose than that of regulating the heat of a stove in which such rod shall be acted upon directly by the heat of the stove, or the fire which it contains.' The Supreme Court sustained such disclaimer as a good disclaimer under the 7th section of the Act of 1837."

The original claim is found in Patent Office reports of 1855, page 573, and was as follows:

"The forming of packing for pistons or stuffing boxes of steam engines, and for like purposes, out of saturated canvas, so cut that the thread or warp shall run in a diagonal direction from the line or center of the roll and packing, and rolled into form either in connection with the India rubber core or other elastic material, or without, as said core."

So the disclaimer practically strikes out the words "or without", from the claim leaving it thereby covering a narrower field. Now, to contrast the remedy of disclaimer with that of reissue, the statute is that wherever, similarly without fraud and by inadvertence,

accident or mistake, an error has been made in taking out the original patent,—both statutes, reissuing and disclaimer statute are founded upon that,—and a change in, or additional specification or claim is necessary,—then reissue must be resorted to, and with its heavy penalty; first that in a reissue you must surrender your original patent, and with the surrender of that original patent abates every suit for infringement that has been begun on it, abates every claim of profit and damages because of infringement—that is all wiped off the slate by the act of surrendering the original patent as a condition for getting a reissue of patent. And in addition, in the Patent Office, the Patent Office examiners have a responsibility with respect to a reissue correction, and they have none with respect to a disclaimer. Their responsibility with respect to the reissue correction is that they re-examine the entire field of validity and novelty, and consider over again every claim made and the responsibility for doing that is upon the Commissioner and his examiners, and the proceeding is long and expensive and may involve interferences, just as the original application for patent. So the reissue statute, while it is remedial and beneficial,—it was passed in 1832, and it was passed to mitigate the severity of the situation about which Mr. Kremer spoke, that where there is a single claim too broad in the patent, the whole patent and every claim in it is invalid; that was common law; the English law at that time. To mitigate that, came this reissue statute, and five years later,—1836 or 1837, to meet the case where a mere cutting off of part

of the claims was required, came the disclaimer statute with its greater benefit, namely that it involved no surrender of anything in the past, no surrender of the old patent or of claims of infringement; no re-examination in the Patent Office; no proceeding by the Commissioner of Patents in which he had a function and no responsibility or duty upon him; it was simply a formal—the most formal possible sort of a gift to the public, a dedication of something that could be distinguished or that was left and could be dedicated to the public by simply cutting it off from the claim.

Now, another example. *Electric Accumulator Co. v. Julien Electric Co.*, 38 Fed. 117.

(Coxe C. C. 2, 1889.) There is in that case a very long and interesting discussion of the whole subject of disclaimers by Judge Coxe away back in 1889, that your Honor will find interesting and useful. On page 137 Judge Coxe discusses the facts in the case before him. There was only one claim there and it covered the application of an active coating to a supporting core, for the purpose of a secondary or storage battery; the application in the form of a paint, paste or cement, or by galvanic deposition or chemical precipitation or otherwise. That was the claim, the electrode made in that way.

Says Judge Coxe: "The part of the invention which bona fide belongs to Faure is an electrode in a secondary battery consisting of a support coated with an insoluble layer of active material in the form of a paste, paint or cement, so as to be or instantly become spongy, etc. It was this that the scientific world rec-

ognized as a discovery of great merit and importance. It was this that the distinguished Scotch electrician (Lord Kelvin) regarded as 'marvelous.' And this was the result of Faure's genius. No one anticipated him. It is honestly his. But what he did not invent was an electrode in a secondary battery, coated with a soluble layer of active material. Neither did he invent an electrode on which the active material is applied by 'galvanic action or chemical precipitation, or otherwise.' The claim is broad enough to cover all these forms probably, and some of them certainly. What he is not fairly entitled to he wishes to give up, and keep what is certainly his own. He does not seek to broaden his patent, but greatly to restrict it. No one will infringe unless he constructs his battery in the one way to which the patent will be confined. This is the patentee's way, and it has many distinguishing characteristics which differentiate it from the ways pointed out by others. The matter to be relinquished is distinct and separate, and can be excised without mutilating what is left. No amendment is necessary. The claim, read in the light of the description, is too broad. It is sought to limit it. The disclaimer suggested will not make a new patent, or a different invention. The invention is fully described in the specification, and the limited claim will stand on that description. After giving the subject a most careful consideration it is thought that Faure was the originator of the invention just described and that it would be unjust to him to declare the patent wholly void, if he is willing to restrict it to what is lawfully his own."

The disclaimer is found in 47 O. G., 276, April 16, 1889.

"The Electrical Accumulator Co., New York., N. Y., enters its disclaimer to—

'From the first claim of said letters patent, No. 252002, any electrode of a secondary battery coated with an active layer of absorbitive substance, to which this active layer is wholly applied otherwise than in the form of a paste, paint, or cement, practically insoluble in the electrolytic liquid.'

So there is the identical sort of emasculating exception, as Mr. Kremer called it, that occurs in our case, the exception being the residue that was left, the invention that was really made, attained by the excising of everything else. In addition the disclaimer cut out these phrases from the specification. "In the form of a deposit by galvanic action or chemical precipitation or otherwise," also in another sentence the words "in any suitable way," also in another place the following "the plates *a* can be coated with an active porous layer in any suitable way." Those phrases are struck out.

Now, another illustration, *Thompson v. Bushnell*, 96 Federal 238. This was a simple little mechanical case. The patent after the disclaimer was held to be valid; it had been held invalid before the disclaimer. The disclaimer was filed and the patent held valid, and the court discusses the question of the disclaimer.

"It was intimated that the patent could be sustained only if limited to hack saws and band saws. Acting

upon this suggestion, the owners of the patent on July 18th, 1895, filed a disclaimer in the Patent Office 'of so much of said claims as covers circular saws and hack saws, leaving said claims to include only hack saws and band saws.' "

"Thereafter they brought this suit, and upon proof that defendant had sold some saw blades that in the opinion of the court were 'either hardened to the base line of the teeth, or so near it that the variance from the distinctive fractional tempering of the patent was trivial,' the Circuit Court entered an interlocutory decree for injunction and accounting, from which decree this appeal is taken.

'The appellant contends that the disclaimer is not a proper one, and is therefore void. The theory of this contention is that there is no separate invention, and that, inasmuch as the different kinds of metal saws known to the art are distinguished from each other by their particular kind of mounting, a restriction of the claim to any one kind of saw is practically adding to the claim a new element, to wit, the kind of mounting. Reference is made to *Machine Company v. Searle*, 8 C. C. A., 476, 60th Fed. 82, and to *Hailes v. Stove Co.*, 123 U. S. 582, 8 Sup. Ct. 262, where it is held that disclaimer cannot be availed of when 'it requires an amended specification or supplemental description to make an altered claim intelligible or relevant.' But this cause is not within such ruling. The invention, and the sole invention, of the patent, as was held in the *Jennings* case, consisted in locating the temper line practically coincident with the bottoms of the teeth. It

is manifest that this location of the temper line might be applied to any one of the four well known varieties of saw—circular, back, hack, or band; but, if applied to circular or back saws, it would subserve no useful purpose, and the patent might fairly be held void for want of utility. When applied to hack or band saws, however, it would accomplish ‘a desirable result’, as the Circuit Court and this court both held. The phraseology of the claim, however, read in connection with the specification, was broad enough to cover all four varieties of the class known as ‘metal saws’, although as to two of them it was useful, and as to the other two useless. Certainly there was an actual, separable invention, and a specification and claim broader than the invention. In view of the fact that the four varieties of this class of saw were well known to the trade and their difference clearly recognized, as the evidence shows, no amended specification or supplemental description is required to make the new claim intelligible, and a disclaimer of circular and back saws leaves the patent in force as to the other varieties of the class.

“There is no force in the contention that there has been any unreasonable delay in filing the disclaimer. Defendant insists that the owners of the patent should have realized the necessity of so doing when the evidence as to prior use of a narrow tempered slip in circular saw and back saws was introduced in the Jennings case (November 28th, 1892). But the Circuit Court in that case, with such evidence before it, did not consider disclaimer necessary. It was only when the decision of this court was filed, May 28th, 1895, that

the owners of the patent were apprised of the necessity of disclaimer, and they filed it in July, 1895. They certainly acted with reasonable promptness.

Now, another illustration. *Schwarzwalder v. New York Filter Company*, (66 Fed. 152), Second Circuit Court of Appeals, 1895. In that case a part of the specification was disclaimed. The court says: "The claim is as follows:"—Here again, there was only one claim—"The method of arresting and removing the impurities from water during an interrupted passage of same from a supply pipe into a filtering apparatus, then through a filter bed contained therein—" I will read the latter part: "Which method consist in introducing into the water, simultaneously with its passage through or into the filter, a substance which will sufficiently coagulate or separate the impurities to facilitate their arrest and removal by the filter bed, thus obviating the necessity of employing settling basins." It was narrowed down with respect to these substances, so note the language: "A substance which will sufficiently coagulate or separate the impurities to facilitate their arrest and removal by the filter beds, thus obviating the necessity of employing settling basins."

Now, continues Judge Wallace: "After a litigation upon the patent in a suit in the United States Circuit Court for the Northern District of Illinois, in which, in February, 1889, the bill of infringement was dismissed, and on July 27th, 1889, the owner of the patent filed in the patent office a disclaimer of that part of the specification of the patent which is in the following words: 'I do not confine myself to the em-

ployment of persulphate or perchloride of iron or permanganate of potassia, but make use of any other suitable agent which is capable of coagulating impurities of the liquid and preventing their passage through the filter bed. Neither do I limit myself to any particular proportion of quantities of the coagulating agents, as they may be varied according to circumstances and the character of the liquid to be treated. Nor do I confine myself to any particular liquid although I contemplate chiefly the purification of water in large quantities.' ”

Now, all of that broadening language and specification was stricken out by the disclaimer after the unfavorable decision in Illinois.

“But it has been urged for the appellants, that the patent before the disclaimer covered broadly any continuous process of filtration of any liquid in which the treatment with any coagulants or reagents is adopted and that the validity of the patent as regards the defense of want of novelty is to be tested by its original terms and scope. We are aware of no principle which permits a patent to be defeated for want of novelty in respect to the subject-matter which has been eliminated from it by a disclaimer. The office of a disclaimer is to enable the patentee to save himself from the peril of such a defense. Matters which have been properly disclaimed cease to be a part of the invention, and, as was said by the Supreme Court in *Dunbar v. Myers*, 94 U. S. 104; ‘It follows that the construction of the patent must be the same as it would be if such matters had never been included in the description of the invention or the claims of the specification.’ ”

Judge Wallace, continuing says: "It is also urged for the appellants that the effect of the disclaimer was to limit the method of the patent to one in which perchloride or persulphate of iron is used as a coagulant. If these coagulants, only, instead of coagulants 'Such as perchloride or persulphate of iron', had been mentioned in the description of the invention, there would be much force in the argument; and it might well be held that by disclaiming 'the use of any other suitable agent which is capable of coagulating the impurities,' all equivalents would be excluded. The literal effect of the disclaimer is to confine the claim to a method in which no other coagulants are employed except 'such as salts of iron.' It is to be observed, however, that the part disclaimed is not part of the descriptive matter, but a recital intended to enlarge the scope of the claim. The disclaimer consequently operates only to expunge from the claim what otherwise would, by force of the recital, be incorporated into it constructively. Obviously, it was intended to obliterate the recital from the patent, and to have no other effect. The patent, after the disclaimers, is to be read exactly as though the recital had never been inserted. Thus read, it is clear that the claim covers the use of any coagulant having similar properties to the salts of iron, which was a recognized equivalent."

Another illustration. *Simplex Company vs. Pressed Steel Car Co.*, 189 Fed. 70, Second Circuit Court of Appeals. There the patent after disclaimer was held valid and infringed. Judge Coxe, speaking for that court says: "The specification contains a statement

that, though the best results are obtained by keeping the tension member straight, if the construction be varied by bending the tension member and keeping the compression member straight it will still be within the spirit of the invention.

"The Circuit Court, however, permitted a disclaimer to that part of the specification, so that the patent is now limited to a bolster having a straight tension member and a compression member with its end bent at a point approximately over the place of support. That the court was entirely justified in permitting a disclaimer is, we think, clearly established by the authorities. The effect of the disclaimer was not to broaden the claim, but to limit it to the construction described and shown, of a straight tension member and a bent compression member. Until this disclaimer was allowed it was possible to contend for a construction of claim 6 broad enough to include a structure described in the language disclaimed, viz., a straight compression member and a bent tension member. That this was a proper case for a disclaimer and that the language disclaimed is no longer a part of the specification, are propositions which are sustained by the following authorities: *Dunbar v. Meyers*, 94 U. S. 187, 24 L. Ed. 34, and cases cited in *Accumulator Co. v. Julien Co.* (C. C.) 38 Fed 117, 133-136.

"In *Carnegie Co. v. Cambria Co.*, 185 U. S. 403, at page 436, 22 Sup. Ct. 698, at page 711, 46 L. Ed. 968, the court says:

'Had the purpose of the disclaimer been to reform or alter the description of the invention, or convert the

claim from one thing into something else, it might have been objectionable, as patents can only be amended for mistakes^{es} of this kind by a reissue. But the disclaimer in this case appears to have been made to obviate an ambiguity in the specification.' "

Now, says, Judge Coxe, "The sole effect of the present disclaimer is to limit the sixth claim to a structure embodying Bauer's actual invention and strictly within its terms. The statement eliminated by the disclaimer was unnecessary and was not advisedly inserted, but there is nothing of which to predicate a fraudulent intent. The statement is gone and to that extent the atmosphere is cleared."

And still another, *Libbey v. Mt. Washington Glass Co.*, (26 Fed. 757), Judge Colt, 1886: "The claims of the patent are as broad as the specification, and are not limited to any particular compound. Since bringing suit, the plaintiff has filed a disclaimer under the statute, in which he limits his claim to the gold-ruby compound. This the plaintiff had a right to do. Under the authorities cited by the plaintiff, this was a patent where a part could be properly disclaimed. It did not require the importation of anything new in the specification, but simply the elimination of a part of what was originally claimed. A disclaimer can be made after suit is commenced.

"The argument of defendants that they have to meet a different case since the disclaimer, and that, therefore, a supplemental bill should be first filed, and then another motion for a preliminary injunction, does not

seem to have much force in this case. The defendants have long been apprised of the real nature of this controversy, and that Locke's claim was confined to variegated glassware made from gold-ruby. This was the main issue in the interference proceedings in the patent office between Locke and the defendant Shirley, where the examiners in chief, in a well considered opinion, decided in favor of Locke as the prior inventor. The disclaimer has been filed since August 29th, and the defendants, so far as appears, have had sufficient time since then to prepare their defense to this motion. We do not see how their rights have been prejudiced in any degree by the disclaimer."

One other example—there are an endless number of them in the books—Page v. Dow, 200 Fed. 72, 1892,¹⁹¹² Hazel Judge.

There the patent had been declared valid and the claim infringed. "The record before the court is the result of a supplemental bill averring infringement of claim 12, which heretofore was held not infringed, and which was amended by disclaimer filed in the patent office after affirmance by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the original opinion. It was held by me on rehearing that the 'constantly acting source of power', an element of the original claim 12 did not mean the constantly rotating shaft with which the machine is provided, but referred solely to the electric motor which drives the shaft as the said source of power.

"Claim 12, as amended by the disclaimer, reads substantially as follows:

“‘12. In a printing telegraph receiver, the combination of a type-wheel, paper-feeding mechanism, a constantly rotating drive shaft, and means for continuously feeding the paper without feeding the type-wheel as long as said drive shaft is supplying power, for substantially the purposes set forth.’

“It will be noticed on comparison with the original claim that the words ‘a constantly rotating drive shaft’ have been substituted in place of the words ‘constantly acting source of power’

“The defendant insists that the disclaimer changes the character of the invention and substitutes a different element, but I am persuaded by the proofs to the contrary. To substitute the words ‘constantly rotating drive shaft’ for the words ‘constantly acting source of power’ did not, in my opinion, alter or change the invention; nor was it the addition of an equivalent element for one that had been abandoned. The effect of the disclaimer was merely to limit the original claim, which was thought too broad, to a constantly rotating drive shaft actuated by a constantly rotating motor. Disclaimers of this description, when filed within reasonable time of the discovery that a disclaimer is necessary, have many times received the approval of the Federal Courts.” A long citation of cases.

Then, there is a most excellent discussion of this whole law of disclaimer in *Suddard v. American Motor Car Company*, 163 Federal, 852, which I will not go into here, simply an interesting case to study and a

long essay on the subject, a very able treatment of the whole question.

Now, our disclaimer here, what is it? It is simply a cutting off and excising from claim 9, 10, and 11 of that excess, whatever it may be—we don't know—of that excess which caused the Supreme Court to say and to hold these claims invalid and too broad.

And down to what did we cut these claims? We cut these claims down to the exact invention which the Supreme Court says we made and to which the Supreme Court says our patent must be confined. We quote the language of the Supreme Court in our disclaimer. This is the language of our disclaimer following what the Supreme Court says, "Does hereby disclaim from claims 9, 10 and 11 of said letters patent"—the universal, the general, the accepted method of disclaimer—"We do hereby disclaim from these claims any process of concentrating, the process of concentrating powdered ores,"—these words are quoted from these three claims—"process of concentrating powdered ores," here is the way each one of these three claims start. "Excepting—" we disclaim everything "excepting—", now we are not going to disclaim what the Supreme Court has said is ours, not one mite of what the Supreme Court has said is ours, not one jot or tittle of what the Supreme Court has said is ours are we going to disclaim, are we going to abandon, are we going to dedicate to the public; but everything else, everything except that, we dedicate to the public. Any process—we disclaim from these claims any process of concentrating powdered ores excepting—now, we put in the Supreme

Court's definition—"where the results obtained are"—now we don't use quotation marks, but they might have been used—"the results obtained by the use of oil" in a quantity "amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore." Now, whatever—that is it is based on this language of the decision of the Supreme Court, "and the patent must be confined to the results obtained." The "patent must be confined to the results obtained." Now, the Supreme Court identifies these results this way: "By the use of oil within the proportion often described in the testimony and in the claims of the patent as a proportion amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore." So we disclaim everything from these claims, everything that would be within the language of these claims 9, 10 and 11, excepting, where the results obtained are (as the Supreme Court says we are entitled to claim), the results obtained by the use of oil in a quantity amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore.

It was our purpose and intention to disclaim from these claims and so from the patent everything that the Supreme Court held or thought was not ours. It was our purpose and intention to retain within the patent and within these claims of the patent everything that the Supreme Court has held is properly ours, and in the language of the Supreme Court where it defines what is properly ours—that language we may not know what it means, that language is to be construed perhaps by this court, perhaps by the Supreme Court itself, perhaps by other courts, but whatever it means as used by the Supreme Court, that

it means as used by us in our disclaimer. If by "results" the Supreme Court meant the rising of this froth, and the concentrating in that way, that we propose to hold and claim by these claims 9, 10 and 11 of our patent. If the Supreme Court meant to contrast a result which we could not hold, the Cattermole effect of granulation and securing the concentrating of the ore in that way, we disclaim that by our disclaimer. Our disclaimer leaves as a residue in the patent, in our intention, nothing but that subject matter which the Supreme Court has said is justly ours. Our disclaimer leaves in the patent in and by claims 9, 10 and 11, in the legal effect, nothing but what the Supreme Court has held is justly ours, and it is a proper ^{case}~~question~~ for disclaimer and is not a case for re-issue, because to attain that end nothing has to be added to the complaint, not a word to the specifications of the claims, no different description need be given anywhere, nothing has to be done but to deduct the overplus, whatever that overplus may be, dedicate that to the public, and that we do by our disclaimer; and nothing more do we do by our disclaimer.

Now, if your honor pleases, the other claims in the patent may fill the whole measure of that invention, and they may not. That is a question that may arise in future litigation, possibly in this. If they were not broader than the real invention the Supreme Court would hold them valid as it did even though they were narrower.

A man may claim less than he has a right to claim as new. So the Supreme Court would hold valid any

claim that was less narrow in its scope than the real invention.

For example, it has validated some claims that are limited to heat. Our invention is not limited to heat; it is broader than that. Claim No. 3—that was inside the ~~foad~~ scope of the invention. Claim No. 2 is limited to the use of an acidified pulp. The Supreme Court has held No. 3 and No. 2, valid. No. 2 is narrower than our entire invention. Some of the other claims validated are limited to very microscopic quantities of oil. An example is claim No. 5, limited to from .02 up to .5; clearly that is narrower than the purview of our invention as defined by the Supreme Court, because it has said that the patent must be confined to the results obtained by the use of any fraction of one per cent. Claim No. 5 is a claim of one half of one per cent, or under. So the validating of those claims does not mean that the Supreme Court was of the opinion that they filled the whole bill, that they went to the utmost extent of our invention. When we come to claim one and twelve, they may fill the full measure of our invention or they may not; they are limited to the process wherein the oil referred to and that operates in the process is a fraction of one per cent—anything up to one per cent. That may be the full measure of our invention in the intention of the Supreme Court, and it may not. The Supreme Court, in contrast to that, said—"the patent must be confined to *the results* obtained when that amount of oil is used." Now, if somebody, within the language of claims 9, 10 and 11, obtains that result, although he may obtain it by using

more than one per cent of oil, he is within that definition of what we are entitled to claim, which the Supreme Court has laid down for us and for you and for the defendant here, and we think that that definition is the law of this patent, and in filing this disclaimer as to claims 9, 10 and 11 and disclaiming those claims down to the exact and whole subject matter of what the Supreme Court has said is fully and justly ours, we have done what we were privileged to do under the law; we have taken out what the disclaimer stated and by cutting off what was not justly our own, but in doing that we are not required to cut off one jot or tittle of what is our own, irrespective of whether the other claims are up to the full measure of that property or not. So we filed a document, a disclaimer, within the letter and spirit of the disclaimer statute, within the authorities of a half century, within common sense and reason, cutting off what was not ours and retaining what is ours, and adopting in that disclaimer for the definition of what is ours, the definition that the Supreme Court itself had given.

Now, to hold that a few weeks' delay in filing this disclaimer is fatal to the whole patent would be a farcical catastrophe, and absolutely without precedent in the administration of patent law and particularly of that statute since the year 1837 down to the present year, 80 years afterwards, and as to the form and substance of the disclaimer, it deals with substance and not with the form; it goes to the core of the matter. The Supreme Court has told us what we did not ourselves know before, or when we took out this patent.

just what the boundaries of our invention are, and by this document we cut those three claims down exactly to that boundary, thereby insuring to ourselves that we have some claim or claims in this patent up to the full measure of that boundary, so that not a bit of the territory that belongs to us but what is claimed here.

MR. KREMER: May it please your honor, I feel after having heard the argument of Mr. Kenyon that there was some reason why I should not have understood the statements of Mr. Williams in connection with the filing of the disclaimer; after having heard the argument just concluded I feel now that I should no longer speak from a standpoint of misgiving, but confidently assert that no disclaimer has been filed either within the meaning of the statute or within the intent of the decision of the Supreme Court. Instead of having eliminated anything from the scope of the patent or the claim of the patent, I assert that this disclaimer in its very language gives that claim the full breadth that it had before any attempted disclaimer was filed. Before discussing that, I want to say that I am sorry if I, in my argument, conveyed to counsel that I believed there was anything mystical in the use of the term "claim"; whether it is a single claim or one of a great number of claims, or whether there is only one claim in the patent makes no difference. It is the invention that the patentee must claim. In the case at bar it was the invention that Minerals Separation claimed. The invention of what? The invention of a process or of a result? I was astounded to hear these distinguished patent lawyers in their arguments to this

court allege that the Supreme Court had ever said that they could patent a result, or to hear them assert that a result is patentable, because it is an elementary doctrine of patent law that a result is not patentable. So, disregarding this statement that a result is patentable, we return to the process, and the process in this case is the only thing that is patentable. And what is that process? The Supreme Court—and as lawyers practicing before that court we are forced to accept the decision of the Supreme Court in the language in which it is given, and to comply with the law in connection therewith until that court itself modifies it or changes it—the Supreme Court held that the patent in this case was the patent of a process, not a result, wherein there was a quantity of oil of less than one per cent used. Now, they hold that claims 9, 10 and 11 are invalid. Why? Because they did not fall within the specification of less than one per cent, as it defines in this opinion the critical amount, and I say to your honor that by no forced construction can the effect of this decision be avoided by this plaintiff; by the artful use of words, segregating a single line from the utterances of that court and reading it, so to speak, into a disclaimer, any more than if this court should say, “No, you can’t do this, though if you do a certain thing then you will be permitted to do it.” I could not argue on that that this court had said “No, you can’t do it.” They take a single line and by artful use of that line change the effect of the decision. They put a statement in the disclaimer which would render it absolutely meaningless. Can they be heard to contend,

in the light of this decision, that the Supreme Court held that their invention embraced the use of an amount of oil, say, equal to three per cent upon the ore? 3.6 for instance, the Cattermole proportion, as I recall? That is a small amount of oil. It was that very feature, as it appears from the record of the Hyde case on file in this court and which is now before your honor—that was represented as a small amount of oil. It appeared that there was a resultant froth. It is true that counsel drew, as the records show, a metaphysical distinction upon the ground that there was more oil in the froth. Be that as it may, the Supreme Court in reviewing that record declared that their patent ceased at an amount within one per cent, and that claims Nos. 9, 10 and 11 were invalid. Why? Because there was a use of more than a fraction of one per cent. The merest tyro in reading that decision could place no other construction upon it, and yet in this disclaimer which is here now on file, and the only disclaimer that we have, it disclaims—note the artful manner in which it is put—it disclaims claims 9, 10 and 11, except as to the result obtained by the use of oil in a quantity amounting to a fraction of one per cent upon the ore.

In this verified record, which is before the court, it conclusively appears, and your honor saw the demonstration in this court room, that the result is the resultant froth; that is the result of the application of these processes; the result is the same, the resultant froth, and the Supreme Court has limited their patent to the use of less than one per cent of oil—they disclaim 9, 10 and 11, but at the same time assert that it extends

to three per cent or four per cent or any other per cent, which any court, any place might at any time hold to be a small amount of oil. Therefore I say that they have disclaimed nothing; they have eliminated nothing, as was done in the Silsby-Foote case; they have not eliminated as was done in the McCormick case or the Hull case, or any of the cases cited by the distinguished counsel for the plaintiff. It is a claim without a limitation; they have eliminated nothing. And in this court here and now, after that decision, they are asserting the right to claim all that they have ever claimed before the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States—hence, your honor, the delay. Hence the delay. It was the desire to artfully seem to yield, without yielding, and even though conquered in that respect, they are still unyielding. They are as unreconstructed today as the man who fired the first shot in answer to the one at Fort Sumpter; they have yielded nothing in principle and they yield nothing in law. And so they have come to this court, and in language eloquent and appealing, in the lack of analysis—they say to this court—‘Dare this court apply this rigorous rule of law and destroy what is ours or what would have been ours if we had only filed this disclaimer? Will we be forced to yield this valuable patent because we have not filed a disclaimer?’ They have sought to avoid the provision of that law, and they must pay the penalty.

There was a statement made of which I took note at the time, in reference to their right to apply to the Supreme Court of the United States for a rehearing.

That rule is simply the equity rule, and it permits any party to make application for a rehearing during the term in which the decision is rendered. There are two ways—we must not take these rules to be formed wrongly, because the rules are supposed to have been born and were born of intelligent thought directed to the conduct of litigation. They could have filed a petition for a rehearing, or they could have ordered this mandate down, and when they ordered this mandate down—and it is of record here whether physically present or not—it is filed; Mr. Williams offered it and it was accepted to be filed when it arrives—that is before the court, and when they have ordered that mandate down and have filed no petition, and when the rule of law required them to act in a manner that was expeditious and not to delay in doing what the decision of the Supreme Court required them to do—and they ordered that mandate down, then they stand in law as having surrendered their right to petition for a rehearing. So this is not an excuse for a delay in the filing of a disclaimer, and they have not filed a disclaimer within the meaning of the law.

It would be but a mere matter of repetition to discuss the law of this case, because I find no reason to differ with the principles of law read by Mr. Kenyon from his long and able brief. He has not cited a case that is in opposition to any that we have cited. The simple distinction exists between all of those cases in which he referred to the lapse of time, and the cases to which I referred this morning—the simple distinction exists that mine were utterances of the Supreme

Court of the United States, and he never cited one single Supreme Court decision to your honor upon the question of the right to file a disclaimer after a decision by that court. That is the simple distinction between those cases. The only other distinction between the cases that I cited and those which Mr. Kenyon cited are that Mr. Kenyon sought to construe certain cases as eliminating or yielding certain features of certain claims of patent, while in the cases I cited the yielding was an entire giving up of those rights claimed. I do not assert that they could not yield those claims in part, but where they yield them in part, they irrevocably and irretrievably surrender a part of what they did own; not what Mr. Kenyon referred to as a dedication; they only returned to the public what did belong to the public, and never was the property of the patentee.

So that is the distinction of the law of those cases, and we submit this matter to your honor, and do it, feeling that our position is even stronger in the light of the language of the disclaimer filed here in than it would have been if it had not been filed at all, because the reason is taken from their own disclaimer, that reason being, as I have just stated, that they were reluctant to surrender anything under this decision. We submit that this disclaimer has not been filed without unreasonable neglect and delay, and we submit further that, by their so-called disclaimer they have yielded nothing, therefore the disclaimer should be considered as not having been filed at all.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Well, gentlemen, I need not say to

counsel, of course, that while the court is presumed to know all law, there is some patent law with which it is not familiar. As a matter of fact this is the second seriously contested patent case that has been tried in this court in five years, my present incumbency; and of course there is a great body of patent law with which I am not familiar. When you were stating what was to be proven in this case, why it certainly seemed to me it was not within the language of that statute, and turning back to the 15th Howard, it seems to me, that they had found it to be within the statute largely from construction—more than from the necessities of the case.

Even within the Morse-O'Reilly case they hold that Morse had tried to cover all future inventions of machinery which by means of the electric telegraph might print at a distance, which seems to me to be a different thing than what is involved in this case. The statute says, claiming something that had theretofore been discovered, and that is not what would seem to me to be this case. However, the plaintiff himself seems to think that it is, and of course the court is not inclined to quarrel with their attitude in that matter, and undoubtedly since the O'Reilly case a large body of law by decisions has firmly established the principle of this.

This patent in the Hyde suit seems to have been held invalid as to claims 9, 10 and 11, and the court in so declaring declared that the patent must be confined to the results obtained by the use of oil within the proportion often described in the testimony and in the

patent—which we have called the critical proportions, a fraction of one per cent of oil to the ore. Claims 9, 10 and 11 in the patent run higher than the critical proportion of oil, a fraction of one per cent, and do not define the quantity in that way, but speak of it as using a small quantity of oil.

Now, the court having held those invalid, and apparently they being within the disclaimer statute, the plaintiff has filed a certified copy of his disclaimer, wherein he says:

“Does hereby disclaim from claims 9, 10 and 11 * *
* any process of concentrating powdered ores, excepting where the results obtained are the results obtained by the use of oil in a quantity amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore.”

The court does not understand how the use of any other process is to be dealt with than that set out in this patent, and that part of it defined in 9, 10 and 11 or any other results other than that arrived at by the use of the process of the patent—oil, and in some acid, heat in others, and agitation in others, for the purpose of securing the froth. If, as the cases seem to hold, a claim which is in part ambiguous, as I say this is, that comes within the disclaimer statute, the court is of the opinion that the disclaimer in this part would be sufficient, for this reason he has to disclaim the excess over and above what he has invented; he has to make his patent to that extent specific and definite and free from ambiguity. These claims, 9, 10 and 11, as they now stand, have embodied within them and include within

them a portion of the process which is called the use of a fraction of one per cent of the oil with the ore. That is included within it—I see no reason why he cannot exclude or except that to which he has a right and that which is included. The language as it now stands in 9, 10 and 11 will permit him to use a fraction of one per cent of oil in the operation of his process, and it might be construed—and this I take it is its vice—according to the decision of the Supreme Court as permitting a percentage of oil above one per cent. Excluding, as he does, all except a fraction of one per cent of oil, he retains simply that to which he is entitled by the specifications and the other claims of patent; they are specifically set out therein. I know of nothing in the cases read which would require him to give up this portion of the claim, for it is a part of the claim. The law does not seem to require that, that an entire claim shall be abandoned, but only an excess of that which is held to be valid, in accordance with the other terms and specifications and claims of the patent.

In referring to the time of the filing, the statute fixed no time, other than to say that it shall not affect any pending suit only insofar as the question of unreasonable neglect and delay are concerned. The court would be very loath to hold, regardless of the right to apply for a rehearing in the Supreme Court, that some 100 days after the decision, or a little more—perhaps 110—and something like 75 after the mandate came down—that such a delay in a case of this kind, a patent of this nature, would involve unreasonable neglect and delay. Of course I take it in patent law—I think I can

venture that far—that the law is not thinking solely and only of the possibility of damage to the litigating party, the defendant here—but also of the rights of the public, in constructively insisting that there shall be no unreasonable delay or neglect in making a disclaimer. The court can not see that there has been any unreasonable neglect or delay here, and the court will so hold.

The court will say further at this time that of course both parties are here prepared to try this case, and the court intends that you shall try it, and be permitted to try it, on the merits. Many of the court's rulings may be more or less tentative. If there is shown reason in the final argument to change its ruling on the law, the court will do so. Of course it will not take anyone by surprise nor operate as an injury to either party, not having had the ruling made exactly at the time that it is called for. So the court will not hesitate to change its views of the law.

The objections to the admission of this disclaimer are overruled.

The defendant asked and was allowed an exception.

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't know that I made it quite clear that in offering the record in the Hyde case in evidence I included the decrees that have been entered therein since the time when that record was first offered in evidence in this suit, including the final decree which was entered today. I include them and offer them in evidence.

Now, there are certain depositions which were taken in 1914 and which have been on file in this court for some three years or so. Those are the depositions of Hugh N. Line, Ernest O. Jacobson, and Charles Frederick Chandler. Those depositions are now offered in evidence.

In connection with the taking of those depositions, certain articles were marked for identification. They are described in the depositions. I regret that I have not those articles here physically present, but they were the seal of the car, the number of the car, a bag and a bottle of concentrates, and they will be in my physical possession about Wednesday morning, and I merely wish now to offer them in evidence as described in the depositions, and will actually produce them later if there is no objection.

MR. KREMER: They are all the articles that were marked for identification?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, as described in the deposition.

MR. KREMER: I don't recall whether the record shows any objection to the introduction of these articles or not; if so, you may introduce them now and we will reserve the right to renew the objections to the court when they are produced, provided there were any objections made at the time.

THE COURT: Were they introduced in evidence?

MR. WILLIAMS: They were marked for identification, but not introduced.

THE COURT: You may renew the objections when they are produced.

MR. KREMER: Yes, if there were any objections noted at the time.

MR. WILLIAMS: Counsel for the defendant and myself have agreed to make a stipulation as to the infringement. Mr. Scott pleads that he has not had time to state the exact terms of that stipulation, and I can not now put it in evidence, but we have agreed upon a stipulation which will describe sufficiently the operations of the defendant, to make it unnecessary for us to produce any further proof on the subject of the acts, which we charge to be infringements. We have one other subject as part of our prima facie case, which will receive the attention of Judge Garrison.

MR. GARRISON: If your honor please, we have served on counsel for the defendant a notice and a supplementary notice, to produce, and before proceeding with our oral testimony I desire to have the response of counsel for the defendant to the various items in the notice to produce and in the supplemental notice. The first item is, "any and all agreements, contracts, written undertakings, or written memoranda between James M. Hyde and the Butte & Superior Mining Company, by whatever name said company was known, or any one who was acting or purporting to act for it from January 1st, 1911, to date, or if they have not the originals of any such, then copies of the same. What is the response to that question?

MR. KREMER: The notice was served upon me personally this morning, if your honor please. I deliv-

ered the copy that was served upon me to Mr. Bruce, and a search is now being made to see what, if anything, we have. Are you going to proceed down with your list of items?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, my intention was to proceed down with my list of items and get your response to each, unless you can make a comprehensive response, and save time.

MR. KREMER: I might do that. Insofar as the documents and matters referred to are concerned, the same statement applies, that we are making a search for them.

THE COURT: It was served on you this morning?

MR. GARRISON: That is perfectly reasonable.

MR. KREMER: I think that the general response will suffice. As to the portion of the subpoena duces tecum that is directed to me personally, I would say as to that—

MR. GARRISON: I have not spoken about the subpoena duces tecum; I am speaking about the notice to produce.

MR. KREMER: Well, it is the same thing.

MR. GARRISON: I ask you to respond to the notice to produce.

MR. KREMER: That is what I am doing. The part that applies to correspondence by counsel, I may as well state to you now as at any other time, that, as far as the correspondence of counsel is concerned, under the rule of privilege and not being relieved by my client, it naturally follows that I would decline to produce any correspondence of a professional character with reference to my client's case.

MR. GARRISON: Do I understand that as far as the notice to produce is concerned, your response to that part of it which refers to correspondence between Hyde and the officials of the company is that you have not yet had time to make such search as will enable you to make a proper response?

MR. KREMER: Exactly.

MR. GARRISON: As far as that goes, we cannot go on until they have made search and responded, because we cannot produce oral evidence as to these documents until they have failed to produce the originals.

With respect to the item concerning the correspondence to which Mr. Kremer referred, the request as to that is in the supplemental notice, and reads as follows: "All letters and copies of letters from the officers, employes, managers, superintendents, counsel or attorneys for the company to the attorneys or counsel for James M. Hyde, in Minerals Separation, Limited, against Hyde, or to Kremer, Sanders & Kremer, attorneys or solicitors for Hyde, or to J. Bruce Kremer or to Thomas F. Sheridan or Walter A. Scott, or to Sheridan, Wilkinson, Richmond & Scott, or to Sheridan, Wilkinson & Scott, counsel for Hyde, respecting or referring in any way or in any part therein to the conduct or management or control or direction, or continuance or discontinuance, or the method or means of continuance of the defense of said Hyde therein, and all letters and copies of all letters from said attorneys for Hyde or from said counsel for Hyde, or any of them, to the company or to any of its officers, attor-

neys, counsel or employes, respecting or relating in any way or in any part to the conduct or management or control or direction or continuance or discontinuance or the methods or means of continuance of the defense of said Hyde in said case.”

Now, we are not asking for any confidential communications between Hyde and his counsel; we are asking for communications between the Butte & Superior Mining Company and counsel for Hyde. Now unless Mr. Kremer is making a response in confession and avoidance, I cannot understand the nature and propriety of his response. He says, “You have called upon us to produce correspondence between the Butte & Superior Mining Co., which was not my client in the Hyde suit, and Hyde or counsel for Hyde, and I refused to respond to that because of the doctrine of privilege.” The doctrine of privilege can only be urged where a relation of counsel and client exists. Now, if Mr. Kremer will admit now upon the record that he and Mr. Scott and these other gentlemen represented the Butte & Superior Mining Company in the Hyde case, then of course it will be a matter protected by the doctrine of privilege under the familiar application of that doctrine; but if they were representing Hyde and not representing the Butte & Superior Mining Company in that suit, then correspondence between the Butte & Superior Mining Company and them as counsel for Hyde certainly is not protected by the doctrine of privilege—by any doctrine of privilege that I have ever heard of in any court in the land. I therefore insist that I am entitled to it.

MR. KREMER: I think that I can answer that quite generally. I thought you were directing your remarks to the Hyde matter. We represented James M. Hyde in that case, but I am quite sure that I can respond now by saying that there is no correspondence between ourselves as to the conduct of that case, directed to the Butte & Superior Copper Co. Limited. If there is, why we will search for it and examine it, and if we think it is proper matter under your subpoena, we will submit it to the court subject to any objection we may have.

MR. GARRISON: That removes the misunderstanding, We are not calling, of course—

MR. KREMER: I promise subject to that—

MR. GARRISON: You admit there can not be any privilege under this question?

MR. KREMER: As far as Mr. Hyde is concerned, I will state that, while I don't think there is anything important, yet, if it was only as to the color of someone's hair and it transpired during that employment, I don't think that I should testify to it or divulge it except by the permission of Mr. Hyde; but I do not deem it of any great importance except to myself as a practitioner.

MR. SHERIDAN: As far as we are concerned, your honor, I refer to Mr. Scott and myself—we got this notice this morning, and we are 2,000 miles or 1,500 miles away from our office, and I don't see how they expected us to comply with it unless they want to delay the case long enough for us to go back to Chicago and search the files; no clerk can do it. They

could not tell the difference between matters proper under the subpoena and improper. I don't see why they could not have notified us two or three or four weeks ago. They knew long enough in advance what they would want.

MR. GARRISON: We were misled by the testimony given by Hyde as to the relationship existing between him and this company, until our good fortune opened our eyes as to the truth.

THE COURT: You are not asking the impossible?

MR. GARRISON: No, sir, certainly not.

THE COURT: You cannot ask the court to sit here and wait until these matters are supplied to you, very long?

MR. GARRISON: No, sir, we will not; if these gentlemen will respond with respect to what is here within their own knowledge, and that is ample, we will waive the rest.

THE COURT: They say they are making a search, and I suppose they will do so.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir.

MR. KREMER: Furthermore, in order that Judge Garrison may not further misunderstand, under the issues in this case it will be our position that any and all of the documents called for that are in that notice or in that subpoena duces tecum, are wholly incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial for any purpose, there being no issue in this case that would justify their introduction, if they did in fact exist, and for the further reason that by proceeding against this defendant in the manner in which they have, instead of proceeding in the

original Hyde case by supplemental proceedings, they are estopped and now disbarred from raising any such contention as that which they seemingly are attempting to raise here, by a ~~community~~^{franchise} between Hyde and the Butte & Superior, the allegations of the bill not being sufficient to justify such a proceeding. And further under the allegations of the bill the issues in this case, the Butte & Superior Company could not, taking the allegations of the bill with reference to Hyde and the Butte & Superior as true for the sake of the argument, they could not raise an issue that would prevent the Butte & Superior from having its day in court. The same question was raised and argued somewhat before this court, as I recall, upon one of the applications for an increase of bond. The statement was made there that this case was *res adjudicata* as to the Butte & Superior, and if I recall your honor's position—

THE COURT: I don't remember it that way. I think it was at the time the injunction was applied for.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, it was on an application for injunction.

MR. KREMER: Well, it was in one of those proceedings, I don't remember just which one.

MR. GARRISON: The court said there were not sufficient facts before him then to reach that conclusion.

MR. KREMER: But there was sufficient before the court upon the application for the increase of the bond; but that was several years ago.

THE COURT: Well, I suppose that your objection may be made when they offer their defense in that respect.

MR. GARRISON: That is the only other evidence that we have, stipulation taking the place of the evidence as to the matter of the infringement, and then we are prepared to close.

THE COURT: The stipulation as to the alleged infringement, and about the matter being *res adjudicata* as it is.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir, with that exception we are prepared to close.

THE COURT: Is that pleaded?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, it is pleaded without question.

MR. KREMER: There is a question, and it is a question of law, too. There is no allegation seeking to show that it is *res adjudicata* in this. That will appear from the face of the bill itself. They allege in this bill that the Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, confederated with Hyde, but there is no basis there for showing that the Butte & Superior was a party to that suit. The bill speaks for itself.

MR. WILLIAMS: Read clause 8.

MR. KREMER: Yes, I will read clause 8. "On information and belief, that the defendant herein confederated with the said James M. Hyde in the acts of infringement complained of in the said suit against the said James M. Hyde and was an actual defendant therein, and conducted the defense of said James M. Hyde for his services in assisting in the defense of the said suit; that the acts decreed in the said suit to be acts of infringement were carried on under certain letters patent issued to said James M. Hyde on April 2,

1912, No. 1,022,085, and that since the commencement of said suit the said James M. Hyde assigned to the defendant herein all of the right, title and interest of the said James M. Hyde in, to and under his said letters patent No. 1,022,085, for, to and in the County of Silver Bow and State of Montana, that the acts decreed in the said suit to be acts of infringement were carried on in the mill of the defendant herein and by the employes of the defendant herein and have been continued by the defendant herein in the identical apparatus used by the said James M. Hyde; and that this defendant is a joint tortfeasor with the said James M. Hyde in the acts thus decreed to be infringements and is in privity with the same James M. Hyde and is bound by the said decree against the said James M. Hyde."

That is all a matter of conclusion. This company could, from the standpoint of law, could have financed Mr. Hyde. That would not have made them a party to this suit. And their bare statement that it was a party defendant was ^{is} sufficient in law. So, under the very allegations, this bill is framed upon an infringement, not by Hyde, but an infringement, as is testified to in this case, by Mr. ^{is}Line and Mr. ^eJacobson, and Dr. Chandler, and will be supplemented by the proof that you will offer.

And it is the act of infringement that has made the basis of this complaint.

MR. WILLIAMS: No, every action.

MR. KREMER: You cannot cover that by a general conclusion that somebody is a defendant in this case.

MR. WILLIAMS: What about conducting the defense of said suit?

MR. KREMER: Absolutely insufficient.

MR. WILLIAMS: And paying for the expenses thereof.

MR. KREMER: You have a perfect right to pay the expenses of any litigation you see fit.

MR. WILLIAMS: And conducting the defense?

MR. KREMER: The only thing you could possibly come in contact ^{with} would be an act of champerty in maintenance.

THE COURT: Of course the question would be whether he was your servant throughout and whether you were defending him as your servant and thus defending yourselves at the same time.

MR. KREMER: There is no allegation that Mr. Hyde was our servant.

MR. GARRISON: I don't understand your honor is going to pass upon this until it is raised in the proper manner.

MR. KREMER: Then we will ^{raise} ~~waive~~ it upon the demand here set forth and the statement of counsel that they are ready to proceed, ready to close their case about the presentation of this proof on those documents that they now demand. We then ask that the case proceed for the defendant for the reason that upon their own statement it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial and has no bearing upon the issues in this case and is not properly within the pleadings and the issues here raised. I think now it places it properly before the court.

THE COURT: Well, I will overrule your objection at this time, or your motion, whichever you make it, but when we come to offer this, if you want to be heard further, I will hear you.

MR. KREMER: Then we will renew the objection whenever the documents are presented.

THE COURT: Certainly. Then you are not prepared to proceed further today?

MR. WILLIAMS: Very sorry.

THE COURT: Will this stipulation be ready in the morning?

MR. SCOTT: I think, your honor, they will be ready in the morning. I want to verify the figures.

MR. GARRISON: Do I understand from the other side that insofar as your own records here are concerned, the records of the company and your own personal records you will be able to respond by tomorrow morning?

MR. KREMER: As far as my own personal records are concerned I can respond now.

MR. GARRISON: I want it upon the record at the proper time.

MR. KREMER: You can have it upon the record now that there is nothing, so far as I am concerned.

MR. GARRISON: I shall ask it all over again. All I want to know now is whether you can answer tomorrow morning?

MR. KREMER: Wait until tomorrow morning.

MR. GARRISON: I was trying to ascertain the fact.

THE COURT: Well, they must have such time as is reasonably necessary to respond.

MR. GARRISON: We have endeavored to ascertain what they propose to do.

THE COURT: They will try to be prepared in the morning, I suppose, or the next morning. We will now suspend until tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, April 17, 1917, at 10:00 o'clock a. m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 17TH, 1917.

MR. GARRISON: If your honor please, we are ready now to receive the response of the solicitors for the defendant to our notice to produce and to our supplemental notice to produce.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, are you prepared to respond this morning?

MR. KREMER: I am.

MR. GARRISON: The first item is, any and all agreements, contracts, written undertakings or written memoranda between James M. Hyde and Butte & Superior Mining Company, by whatever name said company was known, or anyone in its behalf or purporting to act for it, from January 1st, 1911, to date, or if you have not the originals of any such, then copies of the same.

MR. KREMER: We have a copy of a contract. I will furnish you not only a copy of the contract with Mr. Hyde, but, although it possibly is not called for

there, yet this is a modification of that contract, and I will give you the entire agreement. I suppose you wish to offer them. If so, then we will object. Perhaps you would like to look at them first.

MR. GARRISON: I would.

THE COURT: Have you quite a number of documents that are called for?

MR. KREMER: I think the document which Judge Garrison has now is about all we will produce. The other correspondence that we have is of the character calling for a certain size of this or that piece of machinery. There is also the matter of the expense of this Hyde litigation.

MR. GARRISON: Perhaps we had better go ahead with our notice, and if you will furnish them we will take them all and look at them.

THE COURT: Of course I do not care to sit here and watch you read. I will give you time to look over them. If you have any more that you intend to produce you might produce them. Have you others?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir, I will read the next item.

"Any and all letters from James M. Hyde to the Butte & Superior Mining Company, (by whatever name said company was known) or to anyone in its behalf or purporting to act for it, from January 1st, 1911, to date, or if you have not the originals thereof, then copies of the same."

MR. KREMER: Judge Garrison, in that connection, you would be compelled, I think, to make that more specific. You are not entitled to all correspondence. If your request is for all correspondence as to

any particular feature, perhaps we can find it, and we will assist you to our utmost endeavor; but it is too broad as it stands. This is not a fishing expedition. We are perfectly willing to produce anything that we have that is germane to this case.

MR. GARRISON: We think that everything that James M. Hyde wrote or received commencing January 1st, 1911, about the time he left our employ and entered the employ of the defendant, that has to do with his employment or with the flotation process or with our patent or with his alleged patent is relevant to this suit.

MR. KREMER: Even if he installed a gallows frame for us?

MR. GARRISON: If ~~that~~^{it} was in your employment.

MR. KREMER: He was never in their employment, as far as that is concerned. I don't think you have a right to ask for everything this way. This is not a proceeding in search and seizure.

THE COURT: Of course it is understood to apply solely to their relations together.

MR. GARRISON: Anything applying to their business relations.

THE COURT: As to the matter of this concentration business under this process; it would be limited to that. Of course the notice is broader than that.

MR. KREMER: Yes, sir; it calls for everything.

MR. GARRISON: It is broader than that because we did not know what shape the matter might assume; if they admit that they had correspondence with him directed to this matter—

THE COURT: That is all the defendant will be required to produce, letters passing between Hyde and the Butte & Superior Mining Company, by whatever name it was known, relating to their operations in the concentrator and in connection with this flotation process. Are you prepared to furnish any such now?

MR. KREMER: Yes, sir, in a moment.

MR. GARRISON: The next item is, any and all copies of letters from the Butte & Superior Mining Company (by whatever name said company was known) or by anyone on its behalf or purporting to act for it, to James M. Hyde, from January 1st, 1911, to date.

THE COURT: That is, relating of course to the process and the suit that is pending.

MR. KREMER: We will produce them.

MR. GARRISON: Any and all pay rolls of the Butte & Superior Mining Company (by whatever name said company was known) on which the name of James M. Hyde appears, from January 1st, 1911, to date, and if you have not the originals, then copies thereof.

MR. KREMER: There are none.

MR. ^{Garrison}~~KREMER~~: Any and all canceled checks of the Butte & Superior Mining Company (by whatever name said company was known) on which the name of James M. Hyde appears, from January 1st, 1911, to date.

MR. KREMER: I have three, I believe, that I will give you.

MR. GARRISON: The check books of the Butte & Superior Mining Company (by whatever name said company was known) or whoever paid out the funds

for and on behalf of the said company to James M. Hyde containing the stubs of the checks on which the name of James M. Hyde appears, from January 1st, 1911, to date.

MR. KREMER: We did not use check books; we used vouchers, and the voucher will give you the same information.

MR. GARRISON: The books of account of the Butte & Superior Mining Company (by whatever name said company was known) from January 1st, 1911, showing the account or accounts between Butte & Superior Mining Company (by whatever name said company was known) and James M. Hyde, or if there is no separate account or accounts of that character, then the books showing any and all payments to said James M. Hyde from January 1st, 1911, to date.

MR. KREMER: Those books are in New York, but I think from the data we will furnish you, that that will be covered—all that possibly might appear in the books.

MR. GARRISON: Particularly a copy or draft of a memorandum of agreement, whether the same be signed by both or one or neither of said parties, between Butte & Superior Mining Company (by whatever name said company was known) or anyone acting on its behalf or purporting so to do, and James M. Hyde, in the year 1911 relating to the erection of a flotation plant at Basin, Montana, and the arrangement with James M. Hyde concerning the same.

MR. KREMER: That is the one that I furnished to you.

MR. GARRISON: Oh, yes. Then the next is, all

letters from officials, employes, managers or superintendents to the company or to any officer or attorney of the company regarding the matter of securing the services of James M. Hyde, or securing the benefit of the knowledge of James M. Hyde regarding the flotation process of ore concentration, and any and all letters from the company to any of its officers, employes, managers or superintendents relating to the

P. 2285, L. 9, insert "or the benefit of the knowledge of James M. Hyde" after "Hyde"

ployes, managers, superintendents, counsel or attorneys of the company, to the attorneys or counsel for James M. Hyde, in Minerals Separation, Limited, against Hyde, or to Kremer, Sanders & Kremer, attorneys or solicitors for Hyde therein, or to J. Bruce Kremer or to Thomas F. Sheridan or to Walter A. Scott, or to Sheridan, Wilkinson, Richmond & Scott, or to Sheridan, Wilkinson & Scott, of counsel for Hyde therein, respecting or relating in any way or in any part to the conduct or management or control or direction or continuance or discontinuance or the methods or means of continuance of the defense of said Hyde therein.

MR. KREMER: There is nothing but the correspondence that passed between the counsel for Mr. Hyde, that is, between Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Scott and myself, in the preparation and conduct of the Hyde case, which of course is privileged and I don't think I ought to produce that.

MR. GARRISON: It is your response that there is no correspondence with the managers of the Butte &

Superior Company or the attorneys for the Butte & Superior Company, and the attorneys representing Hyde, on the matter; is that your response?

MR. KREMER: Yes, in this manner—I want to qualify it. Of course you understand that I am now and have been since its organization, the attorney for the Butte & Superior Mining Company, but my correspondence with Mr. Hyde and with Mr. Sheridan in connection with Mr. Hyde and the Hyde case was in the case in which I represented Mr. Hyde. So don't misunderstand me.

MR. GARRISON: I think we are entitled to the correspondence from Mr. Kremer, the attorney for the Butte & Superior Mining Company, with the attorneys appearing for Hyde; that can not be privileged.

MR. KREMER: There is no correspondence of that nature. As attorney for Mr. Hyde, I corresponded with my co-counsel, of course.

MR. GARRISON: I realize that that is privileged and I do not call for it. I do call for any correspondence with Mr. Kremer, who says he was, from the beginning of the company, the attorney for the Butte & Superior Mining Company, with whoever appeared as counsel for Mr. Hyde in the Hyde suit.

THE COURT: You say there is none such?

MR. KREMER: No, there is none, but as counsel for Mr. Hyde I had a great deal of correspondence with Mr. Scott and Mr. Sheridan, my co-counsel. I don't know of a single instance in the Hyde case where I wrote as attorney for the Butte & Superior; but afterwards, you understand, Judge Garrison, with the attor-

neys of the Butte & Superior there has been a great volume of correspondence between us in connection with that suit.

MR. GARRISON: Your honor sees my difficulty. I realize, of course, that I have no right to and I do not call for any correspondence between counsel representing the defendant Hyde; but I am entitled to all correspondence in which the writer was representing the Butte & Superior, and not representing Hyde, even though he might be the same person.

MR. KREMER: Well, there is nothing of that sort.

THE COURT: That might be, but he has answered that there is none such.

MR. GARRISON: Every time he answers he qualifies it, and that makes it difficult.

MR. KREMER: I do not want to mislead you, and yet I want to make a truthful statement, so I must qualify in order to state it correctly; I cannot answer yes or no to such a question.

THE COURT: Yes, that is true, and you must take his statement as qualified.

MR. GARRISON: I want to understand if there is a dividing line, on one side of which I am entitled, and on the other side I am not entitled, and it is difficult to draw the line, because of the dual capacity in which Mr. Kremer served these two clients.

THE COURT: There is a sort of twilight zone there.

MR. KREMER: To a certain extent, but there was a certain condition there that I am going to state later, which I think will clarify the situation, and then the way will be just as wide as a ^{the} cross street.

MR. GARRISON: I want to say this before this feature of the case is departed from: if it be the fact that the Butte & Superior Mining Company in any way directed the defense or participated in the defense of the Hyde suit, it is inconceivable that it did so without the action of someone on behalf of the Butte & Superior Company. It is possible, of course, that that participation and direction on behalf of the Butte & Superior Company was done by oral conversation, by word of mouth. If it were not, then our call is made for whatever writings there may be, and if the response of Mr. K^eramer covers that, viz., that they have no copies or originals of any writing from or on behalf of the Butte & Superior Mining Company to Hyde or anyone representing Hyde with respect to the conduct of the Hyde suit, of course I will accept that, but I want it perfectly clearly understood that that is what I am asking for, and that is the thing to which I am entitled to have a response.

MR. KREMER: And that is to what I have responded and in this connection your honor will bear in mind that the record shows from the statement of Mr. Hyde, in answer to a question propounded by Mr. Williams, Mr. Hyde stated that he was paying for the defense of the suit by money furnished by the Butte & Superior Company. And the only thing, Judge Garrison, that would mark any connection at all would be that in two instances I believe a bill from Sheridan, Wilkinson & Scott and Richmond for some number of dollars—not a great deal—several thousand, all told, was delivered to me. I O. K'd. it and passed it on to

the Butte & Superior. With that exception I can answer your question that there was no common representation. I trust that I make myself clear.

MR. GARRISON: No, you do not make yourself clear to this extent: That, obviously, whatever the Butte & Superior did with respect to the contributing or directing of the payment of expenses, or what not, of the Hyde suit must be done by some one on behalf of the Butte & Superior Company. Now, if the engagement to do that was by word of mouth, then of course your response would be that there was no writing. On the other hand, if that participation was evidenced by a writing, then I have called for that writing and I am entitled to it.

MR. KREMER: There was no writing except as I say, "I have received your bill for so many dollars; I have approved it and passed it on for payment." I will furnish you that if you wish it. Aside from that, there is nothing.

MR. GARRISON: Then their payment was not as a result of any undertaking or agreement.

THE COURT: In writing, I assume? He is not under oath.

MR. KREMER: Not that I know of.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, I am asking for writing.

MR. KREMER: No, nothing. I am trying to make by statements just as I would make them if I were under oath.

MR. GARRISON: Then I am saying that the conclusion of this is that there is no writing by which the Butte & Superior undertook to do anything, financial or otherwise, with respect to the Hyde suit.

MR. KREMER: I think that statement is quite correct. So far as I know, I know of no agreement or exchange of letters which specify the manner or the amount of what the Butte & Superior shall pay, and I have no such correspondence except which you will find in these copies that I am going to furnish you. There are statements in there with respect to the expenses of this litigation; but you are now asking for correspondence between counsel.—

MR. GARRISON: Or between the companies.

MR. KREMER: I have already told you I would furnish you with a part of that.

MR. GARRISON: Perhaps the matter better rest until we see what they do furnish us, and then I can take advantage of your honor's suggestion to amend my notice if there is something I have not covered, or renew my notice if I find there is something I think I am entitled to from them.

MR. KREMER: We are perfectly willing. We are not trying to avoid the furnishing of anything we have except I do not want to place myself in the position of yielding up on behalf of a client something that I have no right, professionally, to yield.

MR. GARRISON: The last item is: "All letters or copies of letters from said attorneys for Hyde or from said counsel for Hyde or any of them to the Company or any of its officers, attorneys, counsel or employes respecting or relating in any way or in any part to the conduct or management or control or direction or continuance or discontinuance of the methods or means of continuance of the defense of said Hyde in said case."

MR. KREMER: The same situation would exist there. The company had nothing to do with the initiation of the litigation nor its prosecution.

MR. GARRISON: Now, may we have a little recess to look over these papers?

MR. KREMER: I think the shortest way to do this is to give them all the papers.

THE COURT: What will this examination involve? The morning's work?

MR. KREMER: I wouldn't think it ought to take them very long.

MR. GARRISON: I should not think so. I should not think it would take us the morning.

THE COURT: We will suspend until eleven o'clock or such time as I am advised you are ready to proceed (Whereupon a recess was taken.)

MR. GARRISON: With permission of the court, I desire to offer in evidence a copy furnished me by the defendant of an agreement made on the 22nd day of July, 1911, between the Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, and James M. Hyde. I understand it will be conceded that the Butte & Superior Company, Limited, was the former name of the present defendant.

MR. KREMER: It was, yes. Are you offering it?

MR. GARRISON: I do offer it, yes, sir.

MR. KREMER: To which offer the defendant objects for the reason that the document is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial; that under the allegations of this case the proof would not be admissible for any purpose and for the further reason that there is no sufficient basis for proof under a contention of *res adju-*

dicata; for the further reason that the document upon its face shows that it is a contract by and between the defendant company and James M. Hyde acting as an independent engineer, an independent contractor, for compensation at a contract price, which is of such a character as shown by the document, to preclude the contention that Mr. Hyde was an employe or an agent of the defendant company; for the further reason that it has not been contended and it is not now contended by counsel for the plaintiff that the Butte & Superior Company is bound by the decree alleged to have been entered in the so-called Hyde case; and, the foregoing being true, it is apparent for any one of the several reasons for objection interposed that the contract is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial for the purpose of proving any contention of *res adjudicata* or estoppel herein; and for the additional and further reason that no foundation has been laid that would permit of the introduction of testimony seeking to establish *res adjudicata* as against this defendant.

MR. GARRISON: Does your honor want to hear me on that?

THE COURT: Do you want to argue it?

MR. KREMER: If we are going to reargue hereafter all of the questions, I don't want to waive the ruling now upon objection, but I take it from my past experience that we will have to reargue all of these over again.

THE COURT: I take it so. As a matter of course, if anything is not obviously incompetent, irrelevant nor immaterial the court will admit it for the sake of the

record and for the sake of a decision in a higher court, where it is to be assumed such a case will go. If we exclude anything, or have made any mistake in connection with the admission of any evidence, the appellate court may have to send it back for retrial, but if it is in the record they can dispose of the case.

MR. KREMER: I assumed your honor's ruling would be *pro forma*.

THE COURT: As far as the pleadings are concerned, I don't understand that they would be obliged to plead it at all, although they have pleaded it probably after a fashion that might be criticised. It is the ordinary question relating to the title to a patent, a valid patent that they claim is infringed by the defendant. Now, the defendant sets up that the patent is not valid. That of itself, without pleading any further adjudication, would permit the introduction by the plaintiff of a former adjudication to estop the defendant from interposing that defense. I am speaking now of the ordinary rules of pleading and I do not suppose there is anything peculiar to patent litigation as to the pleading. While a rule exists to plead former adjudication in patent proceeding I take it it is largely done to satisfy the old equity rule in cases where they are seeking a preliminary injunction. If A has quieted his title against B to a piece of property and afterwards sues B in ejectment, he simply alleges that he is the owner, does not allege that he has secured a prior adjudication of title against B. If B attacks his title in any system of pleadings or replication, then it would be necessary for A to plead the estoppel in the replication.

No replication is necessary in equity proceedings in the Federal Court. Hence he can introduce it in evidence without having pleaded it. So I take it in this case it is to estop you from the defense of lack of novelty that you plead, and of course the plaintiff introduces it as part of its case in chief to obviate the necessity, if he makes his claim good, of the court first hearing the defense of the defendant, and afterwards taking note of the estoppel. The objection is partly based upon the assertion that there is no claim that the defendant is bound by the Hyde decree. I don't understand that that is the attitude of the plaintiff.

MR. GARRISON: Just the contrary.

THE COURT: If it was, of course, as far as estoppel is concerned it would be immaterial.

MR. KREMER: Do I understand that it is your contention, Judge Garrison, that the Butte & Superior Mining Company is bound by the decree in the Hyde case and that the decree in the Hyde case settles the controversy between the parties plaintiff and the defendant Butte & Superior Mining Company?

MR. GARRISON: Does the court desire me to answer that now?

THE COURT: Why, you may.

MR. GARRISON: I do not want to take the time of the court unless the court wants me to.

THE COURT: You may answer it at this time, to make your position clear to counsel.

MR. GARRISON: Our contention is that Hyde had such a relationship to the defendant company that when they undertook the conduct of the defense of the

Hyde suit, the findings with respect to the validity of the patent and what constituted infringement in the Hyde suit estopped them from re-litigating these questions in this suit. We do not, of course, contend that the decree binds them in the sense that, based on that decree, we could enjoin them or based on that decree we could recover damages, profits or costs from them. We do ~~not~~ contend that they are estopped by reason of their conduct from re-litigating in this suit that which they elected in the conduct of the Hyde suit to be caused to be litigated and settled therein as to the validity and character of an action which constituted an infringement of a valid patent.

THE COURT: The court so understands.

MR. KREMER: They are taking the position then, as I understand it, that we are bound in part by the Hyde decree.

THE COURT: The court understands it so. That is to say you are debarred and estopped from further litigating the validity of the patent.

MR. KREMER: Then the res adjudicata only applies to a part.

THE COURT: Well, that might be a legal proposition. At this time the court of course will overrule the objection and the documents will be received.

The contract admitted in evidence and marked
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 1.

MR. GARRISON: I now offer in evidence memorandum of agreement, a copy of which has been furnished us by the defendant dated the 26th day of October, 1911, between James M. Hyde and Butte & Su-

perior Company, Limited, by A. B. Wolvin, president.

THE COURT: Is this another agreement?

MR. GARRISON: This is a modification, sir, of the exhibit 1.

MR. KREMER: To which the defendant objects for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, and for the reason that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial for any purpose whatsoever.

THE COURT: The objection will be overruled.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

Document admitted in evidence and marked
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 2.

MR. GARRISON: I now offer in evidence a copy of letter dated September 21st, 1911, addressed to James M. Hyde, Basin, Montana, unsigned, with type-written initials indicating it to have been dictated by M. W. A., and we understand that the defendant concedes that this was Maxwell W. Atwater, the then superintendent of the defendant company.

THE COURT: I understand you are offering this as having been produced by the defendant upon your notice?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir; they were furnished us by the defendant.

MR. KREMER: Yes, certainly we furnished them.

THE COURT: Well, it may be received under your original objection.

MR. KREMER: Yes, sir; I was simply trying to ascertain if there was any additional objection. I make simply the same objection as to the last.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Letter admitted in evidence and marked
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 3.

(It was thereupon stipulated that the official reporter should make copies of all exhibits and that the originals should thereupon be returned to the party producing them).

MR. GARRISON: I now offer in evidence a letter furnished by the defendant, signed James M. Hyde, addressed to J. L. Bruce, dated April 24th, 1913. I understand it is stipulated by the defendant that J. L. Bruce was at that date the manager of the defendant corporation.

MR. KREMER: Yes, sir. We make the same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Letter of April 24th, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 4.

MR. GARRISON: I now offer in evidence letter signed M. B. MacKelvie, president, on the paper of the Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, dated July 2nd, 1913, addressed to J. L. Bruce, manager Butte & Superior Mining Company, Limited, O'Rourke Estate Building, Butte, Montana.

MR. KREMER: The same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

P. 2297, after L. 27, insert, "Letter dated July 2, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 5."

dated January 5th, 1911, and over the 1911 is a pencil question mark, and under it in pencil 1912, addressed to M. W. Atwater, Butte, Montana. I understand it is conceded by the defendant that the proper date is 1912. Mr. Atwater was not here in 1911, but at that date in 1912, the defendant concedes that M. W. Atwater was the superintendent of the defendant corporation.

MR. KREMER: The notation was put on there by us, was it?

MR. GARRISON: Oh, yes. We have not touched any of your exhibits. Mr. Hyde was not in this country in March, 1911; he was in London at our office.

MR. KREMER: All right; it was March, 1912. I make the same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Letter dated January 5th, 1911, which should be 1912, admitted in evidence and marked PLAIN-TIFF'S EXHIBIT 6.

MR. GARRISON: I offer in evidence a copy of letter furnished us by the defendant signed with the initials J. L. B., manager, dated May 17th, 1913, addressed to Mr. D. C. Jackling, vice president and general manager of the Utah Copper Company, Salt Lake City, Utah. I understand it is stipulated by the defendant's attorney that the initials J. L. B. stand for J. L. Bruce, and that he was at that time the manager of the Butte & Superior Mining Company, the defendant.

MR. KREMER: Yes. We make the same objection.

MR. GARRISON: Will it be stipulated upon the record that upon the date May 17th, 1913, Mr. D. C. Jackling was vice president of the defendant company?

MR. KREMER: I don't know whether he was on that date or not.

MR. WILLIAMS: The records of the company will show that.

MR. KREMER: To this letter I make the additional objection that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial for any purpose whatsoever. The file furnished counsel was a file containing all of the correspondence that had transpired between any of the parties, but I will submit this letter to your honor at this time. I don't think it is relevant.

MR. GARRISON: Is it your objection that it is addressed to Mr. Jackling of the Utah Copper Company.

MR. KREMER: That is one of the objections.

MR. GARRISON: Well; I will call Mr. Bruce.

THE COURT: No, you need not do that; you can make it good later on, unless you think you cannot.

MR. GARRISON: I was going to get Mr. Bruce to say that it was addressed to Mr. Jackling because he was the vice president of the defendant company.

THE COURT: You can establish that later, unless you say you cannot show it.

MR. GARRISON: I say I can show it to the court now, I can show that Mr. Jackling was connected with the defendant company.

MR. KREMER: And I object that it has nothing whatever to do with this case, and is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial. There is no dispute in this case and never has been—and there is no issue as to this.

THE COURT: It is a circumstance in this case. Of course it does not identify the service rendered.

MR. GARRISON: They will concede that the service rendered was in the Hyde suit.

MR. KREMER: I will further concede that the record shows, brought out by the plaintiff in this case, that Mr. Hyde had sold his rights to a certain patent, and in consideration for those rights, the expense of this litigation was being paid, so there is no controversy about that.

THE COURT: I know, but are they to be bound by Hyde's statement?

MR. KREMER: Surely they are, if they bring out a matter of that sort, unless they want to refute it, but they cannot refute it by ^{and} ~~arg~~umenting the truth of it.

THE COURT: I think we will let this go in; this may be one of the circumstances. I don't remember, myself, what is in the record, of course. The objection will be overruled.

Defendant excepted.

MR. GARRISON: I understand that it is conceded by counsel for the defendant that the case re-

ferred to in exhibit 7 was the case of Minerals Separation Limited against James M. Hyde, the letter being dated May 17th, 1913.

MR. KREMER: We will endeavor to ascertain that for you, just what bill it was. We will make a note of it and look it up.

Letter dated May 17th, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 7.

MR. GARRISON: I offer in evidence a letter furnished us by the defendant from M. B. MacKelvie dated July 28th, 1913, addressed to Mr. J. L. Bruce, Butte, Montana. I understand it is stipulated by the defendant that at that time Mr. J. L. Bruce was manager of the defendant corporation.

MR. KREMER: We make the same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

MR. GARRISON: Will you stipulate that on the 28th of July 1913, Mr. M. B. MacKelvie was the president of the defendant corporation?

MR. KREMER: Yes.

Letter dated July 28, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT No. 7A.

MR. GARRISON: I offer in evidence letter which is referred to in the letter just offered, which enclosed letter or copy thereof is signed James M. Hyde, and is addressed to Mr. M. B. MacKelvie and is dated July 15th, 1913. I offer these two as one exhibit.

MR. KREMER: The same objection, and for the further reason that the last offer is of a type-written copy of a letter signed by Mr. Hyde, and for that reason is not admissible. It is not identified as having been written by Mr. Hyde.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Letter dated July 15th, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 8.

MR. GARRISON: I now offer in evidence a letter furnished by the defendant signed F. R. Wicks, mill superintendent, addressed to Mr. S. E. Janney, manager of mills, Utah Copper Company, Salt Lake City, Utah, dated September 16th, 1913.

MR. KREMER: This is objected to on the ground that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, and for the additional reason that it shows no connection whatsoever with Mr. Hyde or with the company, nor does it purport to connect Mr. Hyde in any way with the company or its operations by ^any one in authority so to do.

THE COURT: Is there anything in it relating to this matter.

MR. GARRISON: Oh, yes, sir.

THE COURT: The objection will be overruled. Of course if it should develop that it is incompetent, the court will rule it out later.

MR. KREMER: Of course I understand that your honor holds that we may renew all these objections as to competency later if necessary?

THE COURT: Yes.

Letter of September 16, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 9.

MR. GARRISON: I offer in evidence letter furnished us by the defendant, signed M. B. MacKelvie, to Mr. Allen H. Rogers, care of Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, Butte, Montana, dated March 1st, 1913, together with an enclosure, namely a statement addressed to the auditor calling upon him to pay James M. Hyde a certain specified sum of money, under date of January 29th, 1913. I understand that it is stipulated by the defendant that at that time Mr. M. B. MacKelvie was president of the defendant corporation.

MR. KREMER: You said this was a statement to the auditor; it is a bill.

MR. GARRISON: It is a statement to the auditor exactly as I said. It is addressed to the auditor.

MR. KREMER: By James M. Hyde. To that we make the same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Letter of March 1st, 1913, together with voucher or bill of January 29th, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 10.

MR. GARRISON: I offer in evidence a paper headed Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, Butte, Montana, March 6th, 1913, containing language as follows: "Voucher payable to James M. Hyde.

\$601.70. Approved for payment," and with an ink signature "C. M. Everett."

MR. KREMER: To which we object for the reason previously stated, and for the further reason that it does not prove any issue here.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Paper dated March 6th, 1913, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 11.

MR. GARRISON: I now offer in evidence a voucher check of the Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, signed by C. M. Everett, "Special." Addressed to the First National Bank of Butte, Montana, dated March 6th, 1913, for \$601.70, payable to the order of James M. Hyde, and endorsed in ink, "James M. Hyde." With various marks showing that it was paid—various cancellations of the bank.

MR. KREMER: We make the same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Voucher dated March 6, 191³~~6~~, admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT No. 12.

MR. GARRISON: I offer as one exhibit papers described as follows: A typewritten paper headed "Expense account of James M. Hyde in attendance on Mill and Patent Suit, March and April, 1913," with items aggregating \$325.65. A paper entitled "Audit bill, Butte & Superior Copper Company," ad-

dressed to the auditor, calling upon him to pay James M. Hyde that sum of money already mentioned under date April 30th, 1913. Then a paper headed "cash voucher" payable to James M. Hyde for the same sum of money, dated March 2nd, 1913.

MR. KREMER: The same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Defendant excepted.

Three papers, expense account, audit bill and cash voucher admitted in evidence and marked
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 13.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until 2:00 o'clock P. M. of this day, Tuesday, April 17th, 1917.

Tuesday, April 17, 1917, 2:00 P. M.

Court convened pursuant to adjournment, all parties present; whereupon the following ^{proceedings} were had:

MR. WILLIAMS: I will now complete a few matters. This stipulation has been agreed upon and I will read it into the record. It is hereby stipulated that the concentrates which were contained in car So. 15679 at Bartlesville, Oklahoma, on September 18th, 1913, referred to in the deposition of Hugh N. Line, given in behalf of plaintiff, were the concentrates produced by the defendant in its flotation plant. It is further stipulated that subsequent to January, 1912, and prior to the commencement of this suit, the de-

defendant carried on a process of concentrating ore wherein the minerals were separated from gangue by agitating the ore in water, containing oleic acid in the proportion less than twenty pounds to the ton of ore, to form a froth, and separating the froth by flotation, and that the defendant also used heat and sulphuric acid in such process.

I now offer in evidence various articles which were identified by witnesses during the taking of the depositions and were marked for identification by the examiner at the time of taking these depositions.

The first article marked for identification seal of car is offered in evidence as plaintiff's exhibit 14.

MR. KREMER: I don't think I shall object to any of these.

MR. WILLIAMS: You have stipulated that this car contained your concentrates. This is the seal of the car.

MR. KREMER: To save time, I don't think there is any objection to any of these.

Seal admitted in evidence and marked PLAIN-
TIF'S EXHIBIT 14.

MR. WILLIAMS: This slip of paper marked for identification, "Memorandum of number of car" offered in evidence as plaintiff's exhibit 15.

Memorandum admitted in evidence and marked
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 15.

MR. WILLIAMS: The specimen of concentrates and the bag in which it was put and forwarded, which

was marked for identification "defendant's concentrate No. 2" offered in evidence as plaintiff's exhibit 16.

Bag admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 16.

MR. WILLIAMS: The specimen of concentrate after some treatment described by the evidence marked for identification "original Chandler sample" offered in evidence as plaintiff's exhibit 17.

Bottle containing concentrates admitted in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 17.

MR. WILLIAMS: I may say generally that these depositions and these exhibits complete that part of the testimony which was described in the affidavits which were presented to your honor on the order to show cause and motion for preliminary injunction and give the details and particulars of the act which your Honor then held proved infringement with an oil proportion which was much less than one per cent, and then there is the general stipulation connecting up these concentrates with the defendant, and the general statement as to operation, concludes the prima facie case as to infringement.

MR. KREMER: Counsel having concluded his prima facie case as to infringement we now move to strike out all the testimony with reference to the infringement for the reason that the act of infringement has not been shown or proven by competent testimony.

THE COURT: Of course the court has not all the testimony in mind, only what is in these depositions. For the purpose of the record the motion will be denied.

Defendant excepted.

MR. KREMER: We now move the court to strike out all of that portion of the statement of counsel as to the showing of infringement or showing that defendant used less than one per cent. of oil, insofar as the same refers to any statement contained in the affidavits on the Hyde hearing, and we move particularly to strike out from consideration in the record all affidavit testimony in connection with the infringement, if the same is to be considered as to the question of whether or not there has been an infringement.

THE COURT: Of course the statement of counsel is not evidence. You move to strike out his statement?

MR. KREMER: Yes, sir; it was offered in an evidentiary capacity; it was an explanation of a certain deficiency, and we do not want the statement to stand unchallenged, because somebody might say that it was stated in open court and not challenged.

THE COURT: Counsel did not intend that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Certainly not; it was merely an explanation.

MR. KREMER: I know, but it is sometimes dangerous to allow those things to stand unchallenged.

THE COURT: I understand that. And your other motion?

MR. KREMER: Yes, I object to the affidavit

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. WILLIAMS: I did not offer the affidavit in evidence; I merely called attention to the fact that the affidavits were repeated in the depositions; that the depositions contained the things that were shown in the affidavits.

MR. KREMER: I thought you were considering the affidavits upon the application for the preliminary injunction as testimony in this case, to be frank with you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Not for a moment.

THE COURT: The court does not think any ruling is required.

MR. KREMER: That is all right; I wanted to be sure that he was not considering those as testimony in the case.

THE COURT: That is perfectly proper under the circumstances.

MAXWELL W. ATWATER, called as a witness for plaintiff, after being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION,

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 1. Where do you reside?

A. Basin, Montana.

Q. 2. What is your business?

A. Mining engineer.

Q. 3. Were you connected with the Butte and Sup-

Maxwell W. Atwater.

erior Mining Company, whatever its then title was, in the year 1911?

A. I was connected with the Butte & Superior Mining Company, yes, sir.

Q. 4. Say in the month of March 1911, and from then on, what was your position with that company?

A. General superintendent.

Q. 5. How long did you continue general superintendent?

A. Until February, 1913.

Q. 6. Do you know James M. Hyde?

A. I do.

Q. 7. Who conducted the negotiations with Hyde, arranging for the installation of an ore flotation concentrating plant for the Butte & Superior Mining Company?

A. I did.

Q. 8. When were those arrangements made?

A. In the summer of 1911.

Q. 9. Between you and Mr. Hyde?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 10. Was anything said by either of you at that time concerning the possibility of litigation over the question of installation of an ore flotation concentrating plant by the Butte & Superior Mining Company?

MR. KREMER: We object to this.

MR. GARRISON: You can't object when I say was anything said; he might answer "no". It is foolish to object until he has answered yes or no.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. KREMER: I will do these things as I think they ought to be done. I object for the reason that any statement of whatsoever kind and character made by Mr. Hyde in connection with litigation or by Mr. Atwater to Mr. Hyde in connection with litigation would be incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial and not binding upon the defendant in this action. Mr. Atwater's authority, under the rights of superintendent not being of such a character as to justify charging the defendant company with any statement made by either Mr. Hyde or Mr. Atwater or any kind or character in connection with litigation. It would in nowise be binding on this defendant company.

THE COURT: The question being merely preliminary, the objection will be overruled.

Defendant excepted.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 11. Which one of you made any statement about that matter?

MR. KREMER: The same objection, and for the further reason that any agreement between this company and James M. Hyde is embodied in the written agreements here on file and presented as exhibits in this case by the plaintiff, and any statement looking to the preliminary arrangement would be entirely improper and incompetent for any purpose, being presumed to have been merged in the written contract.

THE COURT: Well, that might be true between Hyde and the company, but not as to a third party. The objection is overruled.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. GARRISON: So as to make the matter straight, may I call the court's attention to this: the agreement called for here would properly, of course, cover, as the language does cover, all agreements between the defendant corporation and Hyde concerning this subject matter. They have produced no written agreement concerning the conduct, control, payment of expenses of, or other participation in the defense of the Hyde suit, or in any prospective litigation in which Hyde might become involved by reason of his employment in this business; therefore the rule cannot possibly apply that we are relegated to the written agreement, since the written agreement is entirely silent. Now, there may be a written agreement which they have not produced, because in Exhibit X-5 Mr. MacKelvie, the president of the company, states as follows: "I have had in my mind the outcome of the suit of Minerals Separation Company against Hyde, but the contract with Hyde was entered into practically with that knowledge of this pending litigation, and later the company made an agreement with Hyde to defend this suit for him, and at that time did not ask for any modification of the then existing contract."

Mr. MacKelvie said they made an agreement to defend the Hyde suit for him. If they did, and that is in writing, we are entitled to it. If they did not, then the objection that we have no right to get the contents of an agreement because it is in writing, falls of its own weight.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

Defendant excepted.

A. Hyde first spoke to me about possible litigation.

Q. 12. What did Mr. Hyde say?

MR. KREMER: Objected to for the reason that it is hearsay, incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, not binding upon this defendant. Any statement made by James M. Hyde would not be chargeable as against this defendant. It is strictly hearsay.

THE COURT: If the proof in that direction is not sufficient to make this conversation competent, the court will disregard it in making up its decision. At this time the objection will be overruled.

Defendant excepted.

A. Hyde said that if we engaged in the concentration of ores by flotation under his advice, that we would doubtless be sued by the Minerals Separations Company.

Q. 13. What else did he say about that?

A. You mean in connection with the arrangement which he and I had made?

Q. 14. Yes, in connection with the arrangement that you made with him.

A. He asked as part of our agreement that the company stand the expense of any suit that might be brought against him.

Q. 15. Anything else?

A. I don't remember anything more at that time.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

Q. 16. What did you say in response to that?

A. Well, I said that I would, as far as I was concerned, agree to it and would recommend that it be done.

Q. 17. Did Mr. Hyde at that time make any mention to you of any patents of his own?

MR. KREMER: I object to that as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, hearsay testimony and in no way binding upon this defendant, the witness upon the stand not shown to have been vested with any authority to act or in a contractual capacity for the defendant and the statement made by Mr. Hyde to him was nothing more than reciprocal statements of strangers to this defendant.

THE COURT: The ruling is the same as the last. Objection overruled.

A. He made no mention of any patents of his own at that time.

Q. 18. MR. GARRISON: Did Mr. Hyde ever make any statement concerning any patents of his own or any intention upon his part to take out any patents?

MR. KREMER: I object to that for the same reason, and the additional reason that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial for any purpose whatever, whether he did or did not.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

A. Well, later in the year.

Q. 19. MR. GARRISON: Well, just answer yes or no; he did or he did not.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

A. Yes, sir, he did.

Q. 20. Now, when did he make any such statement to you?

MR. KREMER: The same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

A. Later on in the year in October or November of 1911.

Q. 21. MR. GARRISON: And where were these statements made; where was this conversation held?

A. In Butte or in Basin.

Q. 22. And at that time had the suit of Minerals Separation Limited against James M. Hyde been commenced?

A. Yes, it had.

Q. 23. Now, what did Mr. Hyde say concerning any patent of his own or his intention with respect to taking out any patents of his own?

A. He said he was going to take out certain patents covering the particular points in which his process differed from the Minerals Separation process.

Q. 24. Well, what did you say to him?

A. I asked him why he took out patents on a process which he considered the patents which had already existed were of no value.

Q. 25. And to what process did you then refer?

MR. KREMER: I move to strike out the statement of the witness as entirely hearsay, volunteered statements.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

MR. GARRISON: Please read the question.

(Question read as follows: "And to what process did you then refer?")

MR. GARRISON: And to what process did you refer? You said to him—you had asked him why it was he contemplated taking out patents where he considered those that had already been taken out to be void. Now, I want to know to what patents you referred in that connection?

A. Minerals Separation Company patents in suit.

Q. 26. In suit. And what was his answer?

A. He answered that he had been advised to do so.

MR. KREMER: We interpose the same objection.

THE COURT: The like ruling.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

A. He answered that he had been advised to do so by his counsel.

Q. 27. MR. GARRISON: During the time that you were the general manager—that was the title?

A. Superintendent.

Q. 28. During the time that you were superintendent from the date that you have mentioned in 1911 down to the time that you ceased your connection with the company in February of 1913, did you at any time pay moneys to James M. Hyde on behalf of the Butte & Superior Company, the defendant?

A. Yes.

Q. 29. Did you pay him a flat sum of money per day or did you pay him moneys, made up of items of expenses, or both?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

A. We paid him so much a month.

Q. 30. Was that so whether he was here, at Basin or whether he was traveling away somewhere else?

A. I believe that only applied while he was working in Basin.

Q. 31. And while he was away—

A. Or here.

Q. 32. (Continuing)—somewhere else; what items did you pay him for?

A. His expenses.

Q. 33. The company paid him his expenses?

A. The company paid his expenses on trips away in that year.

Q. 34. Did you continue to pay him sums of money—to pay sums of money to Hyde during the whole time that you were connected with the company down to February, 1913?

A. No.

Q. 35. Did you—When did you cease paying him moneys?

A. I think when he left Basin.

Q. 36. And about when was that?

A. That was—why I think he received a salary after he left Basin. I will correct that. While he was working at Butte on the flotation plant here.

Q. 37. At Butte.

A. At Butte. I believe he still received so much a month.

Q. 38. Yes. Just to make that clear, the first plant that was erected, was erected at Basin?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

A. Yes.

Q. 39. And then another one was erected at Basin?

A. Right.

Q. 40. And then another one was erected at Butte.

A. Yes.

Q. 41. All by the Butte & Superior Mining Company, the defendant?

A. Yes.

Q. 42. Were these payments made to Hyde in the form of voucher checks, the signature of which would be a receipt?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 43. And where were these voucher checks, after they came back, deposited—where were they then kept?

A. The checks were drawn on the First National Bank of Butte and were returned to the Butte & Superior Copper Company's office in Butte.

Q. 44. And, so far as you know, they are still there?

A. Yes, so far as I know.

Q. 45. Was he paid expenses incurred by him while attending the trial, the taking of evidence, consultation with counsel, and so forth, in the suit of Minerals Separation Company Limited against James M. Hyde?

A. I don't know.

Q. 46. The vouchers would have to show that. would they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 47. He was, however, as I understand it, paid

Maxwell W. Atwater.

expenses when away from Basin after you made the arrangement with him?

A. On his trips away from Basin to Duluth or New York and I believe to London, but I am not sure about that. He rendered statements of expenses.

Q. 48. Duluth at that time was the head office of the company was it not?

A. Yes.

Q. 49. And what had New York to do with the company—was there a branch office there is all I want to know?

A. In 1911?

Q. 50. Yes.

A. No.

Q. 51. Was there in 1912?

A. Yes, sir—there wasn't a branch office; it was the head office.

Q. 52. They had moved it from Duluth to New York?

A. In 1912, I believe, yes, sir.

Q. 53. Was that when Mr. Jackling became connected with the company?

MR. KREMER: I object to that as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial; not a thing on earth to do with the question.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

A. Yes.

Q. 54. MR. GARRISON: And did Mr. Jackling remain with the company down to the time that you left?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

A. Yes.

Q. 55. Now, you have said that there were three ore separation flotation plants erected during the time that Hyde was engaged in this business, one at Butte. When was that erected, generally speaking?

A. The one at Butte?

Q. 56. I beg your pardon. I mis-spoke myself. The first one at Basin?

A. In July, 1911, the first one.

Q. 57. That was erected with moneys of the Butte & Superior Mining Company, the defendant?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 58. And the ore concentrated in it belonged to whom?

A. Belonged to the Butte & Superior Company.

Q. 59. And the concentrates belonged to whom?

A. To the Butte Superior Company.

Q. 60. Do those same answers remain true as to the second plant erected at Basin and the third plant erected at Butte?

A. They remain true.

Q. 61. Did you voluntarily appear here today or come under subpoena?

A. I was subpoenaed.

MR. GARRISON: You may take the witness.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. KREMER:

X-Q. 62. When were you subpoenaed?

A. Monday morning, yesterday morning.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 63. Did you make any per diem arrangements for compensation with the Minerals Separation?

A. I made no arrangements. I receive a fee.

X-Q. 64. How much of a fee?

A. \$1.50 a day.

X-Q. 65. \$1.50 a day. Did you receive the same fee for testifying for the Mineral Separation in the Miami case?

MR. GARRISON: I object ^{to} that as absolutely irrelevant and immaterial what he received in some other case.

MR. KREMER: We have a right to show his interest.

THE COURT: Just to show under the circumstances if there is any interest or feeling. You may answer. I understand the Miami case was a case by this plaintiff involving the same process.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, but not against these defendants, unless they concede it. Do you concede that you were the defendant of the Miami case?

MR. KREMER: I have asked the witness a question.

THE COURT: The court should not interject any understanding. I will leave you show it by evidence. Proceed.

A. I received quite a different compensation at the Miami trial.

MR. KREMER: How much compensation did you receive for testifying for this plaintiff in the Miami case?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. GARRISON: I object. How can this be relevant or material in this suit unless this defendant concedes that they were the defendant or unless they participated in the defense of the Miami case.

THE COURT: It would be only to show the relation that they had or might exist or did exist between the plaintiff and this witness. You asked him if he had been subpoenaed in order to show that he was here not voluntarily. Now, I think they had a right to go a little farther, but I don't think the court will insist on this point. He can assume, I think, that there was a good substantial fee. The objection will be sustained.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

X-Q. 66. How long were you on the Miami case in Wilmington, under retainer from the Minerals Separation?

A. About six weeks.

X-Q. 67. Had you, previous to that time, been under retainer from the Minerals Separation?

MR. GARRISON: I object. I can't see how it is relevant or material in this suit.

THE COURT: To show the relation between the parties, whether he has reason to feel very friendly. He may answer. Objection overruled.

A. Do you mean under retainer?

MR. KREMER: I mean per diem arrangement, like all experts—most of them, rather?

A. On account of litigation, do you mean, or how?

X-Q. 68. In any capacity, Mr. Atwater. Why quibble about it?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. GARRISON: I object to that utterly unnecessary statement of counsel.

THE COURT: Yes, he may answer.

A. No.

X-Q. 69. MR. KREMER: Had never been employed by them before the Miami case?

A. No.

X-Q. 70. Did you seek employment from them in the Miami case or did they approach you?

MR. GARRISON: I object, if your honor please, it does seem to me we are getting very far afield here.

THE COURT: He may answer that question. The objection is overruled.

A. They asked me to testify.

X-Q. 71. MR. KREMER: In discussions with you, your testimony in that case and this, did they suggest to you that in view of the fact that you had previously been connected with the Butte & Superior as a matter of agent for the Butte & Superior that your testimony would be valuable to them?

MR. GARRISON: I object. There is an assumption in that question that is utterly unwarranted by anything in the proof.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

X-Q. 72. Did you communicate to them or did they solicit from you the fact that you had been employed by this defendant in the past?

MR. GARRISON: I object. That is based on an assumption.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. KREMER: It seems to me here is a man that goes upon the stand and declares he was the general manager and contractor for the defendant; he says he comes here under subpoena. The fact is now disclosed he has been under retainer and has been compensated by the Mineral Separations Company in past suits. We believe—we not only have a right, it seems to me, to show that this witness is here under a friendly relationship with the Minerals Separation Company, but if we can to show that his employment was sought by reason of the fact that he had had some previous connection with this defendant—

MR. GARRISON: My objection don't go to that point. It is the form of the question, it seems to me.

MR. KREMER: No doubt the witness can answer it.

THE COURT: Read the question.

(Question read.)

THE COURT: I think you better change the form a little. It is rather awkward as it is—not to dictate your language at all.

MR. KREMER: I will propound another.

MR. GARRISON: Make it clear.

MR. KREMER: It is as clear as I can make it, but I will attempt to do better.

X-Q. 73. In arranging to engage you in either of these cases or in the Miami case, confining it to one, did they suggest to you that they desired your testimony because you had previously been employed in connection with flotation matters?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. GARRISON: I object as utterly immaterial and irrelevant.

THE COURT: What are you trying to arrive at, whether he volunteered or whether they solicited his services?

MR. KREMER: Exactly.

MR. GARRISON: Confining himself to the Miami case.

MR. KREMER: I was going to supplement that by asking with respect to this case, in order to prevent the equivocal statement that "they employed me before I was subpoenaed in this case". The witness has already testified he was subpoenaed here. He didn't come voluntarily.

THE COURT: Read the question.

(Question read as follows: "In arranging to engage you in either of these cases or in the Miami case, confining it to one, did they suggest to you that they desired your testimony because you had previously been employed in connection with flotation matters?")

MR. KREMER: I wanted to find out whether he communicated to them the fact that he was employed by the Butte & Superior and solicited employment from them, or whether they suggested to him by reason of his employment by the Butte & Superior they would like to engage him.

THE COURT: Put that in the form of a question.

X-Q. 74. MR. KREMER: Did you solicit employment from the Minerals Separation, stating to

Maxwell W. Atwater.

them that you had previously been employed by the Butte & Superior Company?

MR. GARRISON: In what case?

MR. KREMER: In any case.

MR. GARRISON: I object, if your honor pleases, to the question of any case.

THE COURT: Let him finish the question.

MR. KREMER: (Continuing)—or did they suggest to you that they desired to employ you for the reason of the fact that you had been in the employ of the Butte & Superior Company?

MR. GARRISON: That is based on an assumption.

MR. KREMER: No assumption. It is a plain and simple question as to whether a certain condition is true.

THE COURT: It is obvious that either they must have solicited him to testify for them or he must have volunteered.

MR. KREMER: No, that is not the question.

THE COURT: I think not.

MR. GARRISON: There is a question with an assumption in it, if your honor will read the question. They are making him their witness on this, and they are not asking him to state facts or to answer questions that may be answered yes or no. In a question like that it makes it impossible to do anything but confuse the answer. I have no objection to his asking a direct question.

THE COURT: I think they are double questions,

Maxwell W. Atwater.

as a matter of fact. Single them out. The objection will be sustained. Put another question.

MR. KREMER: That is what I did before and counsel objected, and I conformed to the ruling of the court.

X-Q. 75. Did you solicit employment from them upon the representation that you had been previously employed by the Butte and Superior?

A. No.

THE COURT: That again is two questions; it is like the old question: "Have you quit beating your wife?"

MR. KREMER: I will reform the question. Q. Did you represent to the Minerals Separation in your discussion with them about employment that you had previously been connected with the Butte & Superior?

MR. GARRISON: I object to that question; there is an assumption in there that he represented something to them.

MR. KREMER: It does not matter whether he did or not. He can answer.

Objection overruled. Plaintiff excepted.

X-Q. 76. Answer yes or no.

A. No.

X-Q. 77. Did they suggest to you that they desired your services for the reason—by reason of the fact that you had been in the employ of the Butte & Superior Company?

A. No, they did not.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 78. Did you testify as an expert in the Miami case?

A. (Hesitating)

THE COURT: Will you answer?

A. Yes, I did.

X-Q. 79. Did you testify in matters appertaining to the use of oil flotation, other than those things which you had observed during the time during which you operated the Butte & Superior mill?

A. (Hesitating)

THE COURT: Well, there is no objection.

MR. GARRISON: If your honor wants to go on with this I am not going to object any more.

THE COURT: You don't need to go into this. The court understands the situation.

MR. KREMER: I want to make it perfectly clear.

MR. GARRISON: I did not object.

MR. KREMER: I know you did not. I want the court to understand my position. We want to make it perfectly clear that the only reason in the world that Mr. Atwater was employed by the plaintiff, or the only reason Mr. Atwater had for assuming to accept employment from the plaintiff was the fact that he had previously been employed by the Butte & Superior and knew something about the facts of its operation.

MR. GARRISON: In the Miami case?

MR. KREMER: In the Miami case or any other case; any case.

THE COURT: I can't see that you need to go as far as that in order to make it clear that this wit-

Maxwell W. Atwater.

ness has worked for the company and has been required to testify to facts that he knew during that employment. The objection will be sustained, or the court itself will object to proceeding further along that line.

Defendant excepted.

X-Q. 80. Mr. Atwater, during the time that you were employed by the Butte & Superior you were the superintendent of the company, were you not?

A. I was general superintendent of the company.

X-Q. 81. Under a salary of \$250.00 a month, were you not?

A. The salary was a little larger than that.

X-Q. 82. How much was it?

A. I believe I received \$400.00 a month and my house rent.

X-Q. 83. When you quit?

A. When I quit, yes, sir.

X-Q. 84. What were you getting in 1911?

A. About three hundred—

MR. GARRISON: I object to that as irrelevant.

MR. KREMER: I think that with this character—that this character of testimony does require an explanation. I want to show the nature of his employment, that incident to the character of his employment he had no right to make contracts on behalf of this company for the conduct of litigation or otherwise, save and except the hiring of men in the mine or in the mill.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

THE COURT: You may proceed with that. The objection to the last question will be sustained.

Defendant excepted.

X-Q. 85. Mr. Atwater you ran the mine, did you not? You were superintendent of the mine?

A. Yes, I was superintendent of the mine.

X-Q. 86. When did you become superintendent of the mine?

A. In October, 1909.

X-Q. 87. And you occupied that same position in 1911, did you?

A. In 1910 or '11, I don't recall which I was promoted from superintendent of the mine to general superintendent of the company.

X-Q. 88. As General Superintendent you had charge of the operation?

A. I did.

X-Q. 89. Of the mine and mill?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 90. You had a checking account covering the operations of the mine and mill?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 91. You had supervision over the books of account here locally?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 92. The books at that time were kept where—to refresh your memory weren't they kept in Duluth?

A. At that time the books were kept in Duluth.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 93. But you made entries here?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 94. Showing all of your expenditures?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 95. And you saw that they appeared on the books that were kept here?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 96. Do you recall keeping an account for James M. Hyde?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 97. You entered that, or saw that it was entered under your direction on the books of the company, did you?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 98. That was your duty, was it not?

A. I did not enter it on the books of the company.

X-Q. 99. No, that you saw that it was entered, did you not?

A. Yes; for the payments made to him, I O. K'd.

X-Q. 100. Who was your bookkeeper at that time?

A. C. M. Everett was auditor of the company at that time in the Butte office, and before Everett came, I believe A. L. Swan was head bookkeeper.

X-Q. 101. You stated that you discussed with Mr. Hyde the question of a contract for the installation of a plant at Basin?

A. I said I discussed arrangements for the installation of a plant at Basin.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 102. When was that discussion had?

A. In June or July of 1911.

X-Q. 103. Was it reduced to writing, the results of your conversations and consultations with Mr. Hyde?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 104. By whom?

A. By yourself (Mr. Kremer).

X-Q. 105. I hand you a contract marked plaintiff's exhibit 1, and I ask you to examine the same and state to the court whether or not that does not embrace the full understanding that you had made or were authorized to make with Mr. Hyde.

A. I don't think it is necessary to read it all through. It is the contract.

MR. GARRISON: I would like to have the question read to the witness before he answers.

THE COURT: You can ask him yourself. He may acquaint himself with the contents so he can say if all the arrangements so far as he knew had between him and Hyde appeared in that contract.

MR. GARRISON: He is asked whether or not it contains the full terms. How can he tell unless he reads it all?

MR. KREMER: I am entitled to the writing as a matter of law; my object^{ion} was that the full contract was embodied in that written instrument.

THE COURT: Never between strangers.

MR. KREMER: The purpose is to show that

Maxwell W. Atwater.

he was the man that made it for the Butte & Superior Company.

X-Q. 106. Are you familiar enough with the contract to answer that question?

A. I think so, yes, sir.

X-Q. 107. State to the court whether or not that does not embrace the full understanding that you had made or were authorized to make with Mr. Hyde?

A. As I remember it, it does. I cannot commit this thing to memory while I am sitting here in the chair, unless I keep you here for a week, but as I remember it, this paper embodies all the points of our discussion, yes.

X-Q. 108. And all the payments that you made to Mr. Hyde were made under the terms of this contract, were they?

A. All the monthly payments that I made to him while he was working in Basin, yes, sir.

X-Q. 109. When you made the statement that you paid him a salary, using the word salary—

A. I did not make that statement.

X-Q. 110. Do you now say that you did not? I am not arguing with you, but I am willing to accept your statement. Did you pay him a salary?

A. I said that I paid him so much a month regularly.

X-Q. 111. Now, Mr. Atwater, I ask you the question; did you pay him a salary?

MR. GARRISON: Isn't that a matter of law, what that was called?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. KREMER: No, that is a matter of contract.

MR. GARRISON: I ask for a ruling on that.

THE COURT: He has stated what he paid him and how he paid it. I think the term you attach to it is rather a question of law, what it would be considered, unless you get the details of what it was paid for.

MR. KREMER: It is in evidence, and if your Honor will permit, I will read it so the question may be settled now as well as any other time.

"He was to receive no sum save and except his personal expenses while engaged in the mill work, such sum not to exceed \$5.00 per day while installing the plant." Was that the contract?

A. That is what is written there?

X-Q. 112. Isn't that what you paid him?

A. No, we paid him regularly \$150.00 a month for a thirty day month, on that basis.

X-Q. 113. Of his expenses at Basin?

A. Yes, that is the way we put it, to cover his living expenses at Basin we paid him so much, yes.

X-Q. 114. In accordance with the terms of this contract, or did you have any other authorization to pay him besides this contract?

A. No, I had no other authorization besides that contract. We paid him on that.

MR. KREMER: So we submit that the matter is clear.

MR. GARRISON: Isn't it already in evidence?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. KREMER: I say that the matter is clear.

X-Q. 115. Mr. Atwater you stated that you had paid Mr. Hyde for his expenses of his trip to Duluth and New York. Do you recall when that payment was made?

A. No, I don't recall when either of those payments were made.

X-Q. 116. Did you make it in one payment or in two?

A. He would turn in his expense account when he returned from such a trip, and I would O. K. his expense account and he received his money from the auditor.

X-Q. 117. Do you recall in what year either of those sums were paid?

A. In 1911 he made a trip and I put my O. K. on his statement, as I said before.

X-Q. 118. Now where was that trip to?

A. I think that was to Chicago.

X-Q. 119. And then you told us that he made a trip to New York in 1912 I believe it was?

A. Yes, I think so.

X-Q. 120. Now then, the only sums, as I understand you—summing them up before passing—that you paid Mr. Hyde was his \$5.00 a day under the contract in evidence, and his expense account for the trip to Chicago and his expense account for the trip to New York. Were there any other payments?

A. No, that is all the payments we made. There

Maxwell W. Atwater.

might have been other trips, which we may have paid; I don't recall; but there were just expenses of such trips and this monthly payment that I mentioned before.

X-Q. 121. You had charge of all the employes of the Butte & Superior Company, outside of the office, and the professional or legal department, did you not?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 122. Could you discharge or could you have, in your judgment, discharged Mr. Hyde?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 123. As an employe?

A. Yes, at that time I could have.

X-Q. 124. Upon what do you base that statement—the contract?

A. I based it on the fact that the president asked me why I did not discharge him—the president of the company.

X-Q. 125. Who was the president?

A. A. B. Wolvin.

X-Q. 126. That was where and when?

A. That was in Butte in 1912.

X-Q. 127. Was he working for you then?

A. Yes, he was there, supervising the construction of the flotation plant.

X-Q. 128. In your new mill?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 129. The Basin contract had ceased at that time, had it?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. GARRISON: I object to that question.

Objection withdrawn.

X-Q. 130. Were you, at that time, operating at Basin?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 121. And was the flotation department operating then?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 132. Was Mr. Hyde operating it?

A. He was.

X-Q. 133. And was he staying at Basin?

A. He spent part of his time at Basin and part of his time in Butte. He was supervising the construction of the flotation plant in Butte, or was supposed to be supervising it, and he was also attending to this plant in Basin. He was also making trips away during those months; he was not here all the time, either in Basin or Butte.

X-Q. 134. When you say why you didn't discharge him, you mean why you didn't terminate the contract that is put in evidence here, do you not?

A. (Hesitating.)

X-Q. 135. Just answer that.

A. Well, the question was put to me by Mr. Wolvin; you asked me and I answered it. He did not say, terminate the contract; he asked me why I didn't get rid of him.

X-Q. 136. I will ask you to examine that contract and state if it does not provide that whenever the

Maxwell W. Atwater.

superintendent of the Butte & Superior desires to do so, he can terminate the contract.

MR. GARRISON: I think whether that appears or not is a matter for the court and not the witness.

THE COURT: You may read it to him.

MR. KREMER: I did not want to take up the time. I thought he had it in mind.

THE COURT: If it appears there, say so, and base a question on it.

MR. KREMER: The question was based upon what does appear, if your Honor please; it is only a question of taking time to read it.

X-Q. 137. Was it not under the assumption that the Hyde process was not adaptable—was not profitable—that you considered terminating the contract?

MR. GARRISON: I object; there is no question whether he considered terminating the contract; he testified that the president asked him why he did not discharge or get rid of Hyde.

Objection sustained. Defendant excepted.

MR. KREMER: Well, on that basis it is only a question of—

THE WITNESS: I was—

MR. GARRISON: No, no.

MR. KREMER: If counsel is doing that for my benefit, he may cease. It is not necessary.

MR. GARRISON: I was doing it in the interest of propriety.

MR. KREMER: It is quite unnecessary.

THE COURT: Proceed.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 138. I will ask you if it was not in connection with the fact that the milling operation did not show the results that you had hoped, that the conversation took place that you referred to with reference to removing Mr. Hyde?

MR. GARRISON: I object. The witness did not testify to anything except that Mr. Wolvin said—

MR. KREMER: That is exactly the situation I refer to.

MR. GARRISON: And he has stated ^{or} that Mr. Wolvin said and now he is asked whether that was not on an assumption in his mind or Mr. Wolvin's mind; and entirely improper question.

Objection sustained. Defendant excepted.

X-Q. 139. Did Captain Wolvin at that time state to you, and was not the substance of the conversation in connection with the incident to which you referred, that the milling operations under Hyde were not satisfactory, and that you should get rid of him?

A. My recollection of that conversation with Capt. Wolvin was that the trouble was not with the process; the trouble was with Hyde. We did not expect to break the contract. Capt. Wolvin advised me, or asked me why I did not get rid of Hyde.

X-Q. 140. You did not expect to break the contract—by that you mean to say that you intended to carry out the contract as it was written, is that correct?

A. Yes, that was correct.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 141. Now, Mr. Atwater, in connection with the matter of the keeping of vouchers. Do you know where the vouchers covering the period during which you issued checks to Mr. Hyde—where they were placed at the time that you left the employ of the company?

A. Well, at the start, anyhow, those vouchers were kept in the mine office—in the office at the mine.

X-Q. 142. Where were they at the time that you left, if you know—I ask so that we can make search for them.

A. I think likely those vouchers were still at the mine, but they might have been at the office down town. We had an office down town when I left the company.

X-Q. 142½. You could not be sure where they were?

A. Either one or the other.

X-Q. 143. I ask for the purpose of locating them.

A. One or the other.

X-Q. 144. Was there any other contract between the Butte & Superior Company and Mr. Hyde, to your knowledge, save and except the contract here in evidence—of course that is during the time you were connected with the company.

A. There was a modification of that agreement.

X-Q. 145. Was that made during the time that you were with the company?

A. Yes.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 146. I hand you this, plaintiff's Exhibit 2, and ask you if this is the paper.

A. Yes, this is the supplementary agreement.

X-Q. 147. Now, was there any other contract between the Butte & Superior Company and Hyde during the time that you were connected with the Butte & Superior Company, that you now recall?

MR. GARRISON: Unless that is confined to his knowledge, that is an improper question.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. KREMER: It could not be directed to anything else.

X-Q. 148. Of your own knowledge?

A. I don't recollect any other one at this time.

X-Q. 149. Now, Mr. Atwater, in your conversation with Mr. Hyde, the first one that you refer to, where did that occur?

A. My first conversation with Hyde?

X-Q. 150. Yes, the one that you testified to wherein he said that if you engaged in the concentration of ores as he directed that you probably would have trouble with the Minerals Separation, or something to that effect?

A. Up at the mine, the Black Rock Mine.

X-Q. 151. What year was that in?

A. 1911.

X-Q. 152. What month, do you recall?

A. Not exactly; it might have been May, but I think it was June or July.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

X-Q. 153. It was before the entering into this contract?

A. It was.

X-Q. 154. That is in evidence?

A. Yes. I said so.

X-Q. 155. And Captain Wolvin was doing the financial negotiations with Mr. Hyde, was he not?

A. Well, Captain Wolvin, the president of the company, O. K.'d the negotiations, but—

X-Q. 156. They could not be closed without his O. K., is that not the fact?

A. (Hesitating.)

X-Q. 157. Well, is it or is it not a fact?

A. Well, can't I stop and think while you ask me? I am trying to recall, that is all.

X-Q. 158. Certainly, if you wish to think.

A. Yes. There was never any contract—never any direct definition of how far my authority extended. As that contract looked to us then, it would have probably not been questioned if I had signed that contract instead of Captain Wolvin; but in the natural course of such operations it would have been up to the president of the company to ratify such a contract.

X-Q. 159. And that was the course pursued in the general conduct of affairs of the Butte & Superior Company, was it not?

A. Not in general, no.

X-Q. 160. Well was it, or was it not; I ask you the question you followed in matters of contract or

Maxwell W. Atwater.

referring to unusual expenditures or expenditures outside of the ordinary conduct of the mines—were not those submitted to the president or the board of directors for ratification?

A. It was customary for me to submit it to the board of directors.

X-Q. 161. Now you said that there was no mention made of any particular patent in your discussion with Mr. Hyde. Did I understand you to make that statement?

A. This written contract—will you ask me that again?

X-Q. 162. I will connect it with something that I think will refresh your memory. You said that Mr. Hyde told you that he had a patent, for improvements upon certain then claimed patents. Is that correct?

THE COURT: He did not say that, I think.

MR. GARRISON: I object to that.

X-Q. 163. Certain issues of patent—

THE COURT: He testified that Hyde told him that he was going to get a patent.

X-Q. 164. He said he was going to take out certain patents, improvements on certain patents then in existence?

A. That is not what I said.

MR. GARRISON: Not at the first interview.

X-Q. 165. No, not at the first conversation, but the conversation wherein he told you that he was going to take out certain patents.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

THE COURT: On the particulars wherein it differed from the Minerals Separation process.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Proceed.

X-Q. 166. Where did that conversation occur?

A. In Hyde's laboratory in Butte.

X-Q. 167. Where was Hyde's laboratory in Butte?

A. It was either at the Napton or the Thornton; it was at the Napton Hotel or rooming house.

X-Q. 168. You stated that you asked him why he did not take out patents covering improvements upon the process, when he claimed that certain other patents were void; is that what you stated?

A. I did not use the word—

MR. GARRISON: He is misquoting the witness as to that; he did not say anything about improvements.

X-Q. 169. Well, I will ask you to repeat that conversation, then; what did he tell you that he was going to do?

A. He told me he was going to take out patents on particular parts of his process, which he considered patentable; one part, I think, on the use of acid, but I don't recollect. He told me—

X-Q. 170. One of recleaning?

A. Yes, I think so. I did not pay much attention to what his patents were to cover. I remember that he was going to take out patents.

X-Q. 171. Do you know whether he did take out a patent?

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. GARRISON: I object.

THE COURT: He can answer if he knows.

A. Yes, I knew that he took out a patent.

X-Q. 172. He told you that he had been advised by counsel that he had something that was patentable, and to take it out, did he?

A. Yes.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION,

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q-Q. 173. Did he mention who the counsel were who had advised him?

A. Yes, sir.

Q-Q. 174. Who did he say they were?

A. Mr. Sheridan.

Q-Q. 175. In answer to a question upon cross examination, and after examining this contract, plaintiff's exhibit 1, which I now hand you, you stated that it represented the arrangement, the full arrangement that you had made with Hyde. Kindly point out to me the place therein which refers to the conducting or paying the expense of expected litigation.

MR. KREMER: That is objected to as improper re-direct and for the reason that there was no testimony with reference to the contract having been entered into between Hyde and the Butte & Superior for paying the expenses of prospective litigation. There is no contract of that character testified to.

THE COURT: I think so.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

MR. KREMER: The witness said he had no authority except that that was given there. He was asked if a part of the agreement was not that the company stand what expenses of any suit brought against him. He said as far as he was concerned he would recommend that should be done, but there is no evidence that it was ever done, and the contract was drawn afterwards, and it was not done, and there is no testimony as to the authority. That is the reason I did not cross examine upon that.

THE COURT: Well, the question does not seem objectionable in that particular. If there is anything of that sort in there—You are familiar with the contract—point it out.

MR. GARRISON: It is not there.

THE COURT: If it is not there, so advise the witness and ask the question based on that.

R-Q. 176. You will observe, Mr. Atwater, that there is nothing whatever in that contract concerning the payment of expenses of litigation. You may take my word for that.

A. All right.

R-Q. 177. Based upon that, do you correct your answer, in which you stated that this contract contained the full recital of the things that you had agreed upon with Mr. Hyde?

MR. KREMER: We object to that for the reason that there is no testimony that the witness did agree upon it with Mr. Hyde or had authority to agree upon it with Mr. Hyde.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

THE COURT: There is testimony tending in that direction. I think the question fair under the circumstances. As the court has said, you can object later if it is not proven that there was an arrangement of that character, and the objection will be overruled.

(Question read.)

A. I will have to correct my statement in that matter.

R-Q. 178. Please correct it; please make the corrected statement.

A. I knew very well that such an agreement did exist and that we discussed it, and I thought it was in that agreement which you just handed me.

MR. GARRISON: That is all, sir.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION,
BY MR. KREMER:

RX-Q. 179. Did you ever see a copy of that agreement?

THE COURT: What do you mean, exhibit 1?

MR. KREMER: No, the one he has just referred to.

MR. GARRISON: He said he thought it was in this one.

A. I said I thought it was in this one.

MR. KREMER: Now, I say did you ever see a copy of this agreement?

THE COURT: The one he has just referred to?

MR. GARRISON: This is the one he just referred to and he said he thought it was in that.

Maxwell W. Atwater.

THE COURT: Make a proper objection.

MR. GARRISON: My objection is he did not say—

RX-Q. 180. MR. KREMER: Did you ever see a copy of that agreement about expenses?

A. No, I don't think I did. I thought it was in that agreement (Exhibit 1).

MR. KREMER: But you were mistaken, were you not?

A. I certainly was.

RX-Q. 181. And you are positive you never saw a copy of such an agreement?

A. I don't recollect seeing such an agreement.

MR. KREMER: That is all.

THE WITNESS: I don't recollect seeing such an agreement.

MR. KREMER: I heard what you said.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

MR. GARRISON: Now, I desire to offer in evidence the third annual report of the Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, for the year ended December 31st, 1914. As this is a very long document and there are a great many figures and pages of maps that are useless and there is only one paragraph that is useful, I desire to read that one in evidence.

MR. KREMER: We desire to know what he is offering.

MR. GARRISON: As soon as we read it you will know.

THE COURT: What is the offer, this whole report?

MR. GARRISON: If they insist. Otherwise, we would like to put in just the one paragraph.

MR. KREMER: We would like to know what it is.

MR. GARRISON: (Handing counsel the book and pointing out a marked paragraph).

MR. KREMER: No objection to it.

Book ~~admitted~~, marked for identification and following paragraph admitted and read in evidence and marked PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 18.

MR. GARRISON: (Reading.) "The litigation in connection with the Minerals Separation Limited, which, at the date of the last annual report was pending and undecided on appeal, in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at San Francisco, has since that time been decided in favor of your company by the Court of Appeals holding the patents of the Minerals Separation Company Limited as absolutely void. This question has been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it is now pending, and a decision cannot reasonably be expected before some time in the spring or summer of 1916. Your directors have no reason to modify to any extent the expressions in the last annual report regarding the final outcome of this litigation. Respectfully submitted, N. Bruce MacKelvie."

Henry D. Williams.

Is it understood that this excerpt is all that now goes in evidence or simply the whole book received in evidence?

THE COURT: As far as the court understands it now you have offered only this paragraph.

MR. GARRISON: Is it conceded that the litigation there referred to is the case of Minerals Separation Company against James M. Hyde?

MR. KREMER: I am sure I do not know.

HENRY D. WILLIAMS called as a witness in behalf of the plaintiff, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION,
BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 1. Mr. Williams, you are the general attorney or counsel of the Minerals Separation ~~Company~~, Limited, are you not?

A. I am.

Q. 2. In the year 1914 what litigation had that company pending which was decided by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at San Francisco?

A. The suit of Minerals Separation Limited against Hyde, which was carried on appeal to that court from this court.

Q. 3. Had it any case pending at that time other than the Hyde case against the Butte & Superior Cop-

Henry D. Williams.

per Company Limited which was on appeal in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at San Francisco and decided by that court?

A. No.

CROSS EXAMINATION,
BY MR. KREMER:

X-Q. 4. That is the same Hyde case that we have referred to here as having been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 5. And at that time the Hyde case was upon appeal from a judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals declaring the patents invalid, was it not?

A. Not on appeal, ^{on} ~~or~~ writ of certiorari.

X-Q. 6. MR. KREMER: Writ of certiorari?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 7. From a judgment declaring the patent invalid?

A. Declaring the patent in suit invalid.

X-Q. 8. And that was the patent in this suit as well as the patent in that suit?

A. Right.

X-Q. 9. Litigation was pending in this court was it not against the Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, upon the patent in suit?

A. It was then—That litigation was then pending.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

MR. GARRISON: Now, there is no dispute, is there, that Mr. N. Bruce McKelvie was the president of the Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, is there, in the year 1914?

MR. KREMER: No.

MR. GARRISON: Now, if your Honor pleases, we rest.

In view of something that your Honor said during the course of the hearing this morning, I was wondering whether your Honor intended to so shape the course of this trial that the defendant should first meet the issues with respect to the alleged estoppel or bar or whether there was to be a general defense, and I thought if proper I would like to receive from your Honor an expression as to the future conduct of the case in that respect.

THE COURT: Well, I haven't given it any thought, to tell the truth.

MR. GARRISON: What is the disposition of the defense?

MR. KREMER: The disposition of the defense would be to present its case in its own orderly way. The position that we take is that there is no estoppel or bar to meet, and the defendant shall proceed, after statement of counsel, of course with the consent of the court, to present its case in the orderly manner that it feels it should be presented in. We, of course, will be guided by our own desires in the matter, unless the court directs to the contrary. We naturally, like all attorneys, in arranging for the introduction of

the defense or the introduction of testimony, have outlined a plan whereby we believe that the orderly presentation will be such that one can readily follow it through and will lighten the work of the court; and that, of course, we will do unless the court directs otherwise. I do not know that we need any direction as to how we would introduce our case unless it is with the direction of this court; we will proceed in what we consider an orderly manner.

THE COURT: What is your view of it?

MR. GARRISON: My view is simply this: That if it be a fact that some principle of law estops these defendants from raising certain questions upon this trial, it would seem to me that the orderly course of procedure would be the demonstration of that situation. We have produced our evidence with respect thereto. If they present their evidence with respect thereto, that issue is entirely different and separate from every other issue in the case, and upon the determination of that issue will depend the orderly conduct of the rest of the case. At the present time if your Honor now enters upon the full defense of this defendant, you will be met at every turn with the necessity of letting in testimony with respect to the validity, we will assume, of this patent or the character of an act of an infringement of this patent, all of which will be immaterial and irrelevant, and never should have been brought into the case. If it be a fact that this defendant is by a principle of law estopped from raising that defense or relitigating that or those questions it does seem to me that it is well worthy of

consideration as to whether we may not lighten the burden of the court and counsel, litigants and witnesses by determining *in limine*—and the question in *limine* is “what is to be tried by me in this suit?” Now, if the issue is to be an entire, sole and complete defense, without bar or estoppel, that is one thing. If the issue is very much narrower than that, that is another. It does seem to me that the determination of that issue in advance would be of great benefit to the court.

MR. KREMER: I assume that under the rule that your honor has repeatedly declared in this case on the rulings upon the disclaimer as well as to our objections to other matters introduced, that a ruling upon all of these matters as they are introduced would be such a ruling as would permit the record to be made for a higher court, no matter what your honor’s views might be as to them, but we of course will present our case in full and of course we assume that your honor would permit this method, no matter what your honor’s views might ultimately be upon this or other questions, to go upon the record here for review by another court. And I will state that we have witnesses brought from a distance perhaps in connection with certain testimony that has here been introduced, that is to refute such testimony as has been introduced here as is capable of refutation. So we will proceed, under your honor’s direction, with the orderly presentation of our case, and we submit to the direction of the court.

THE COURT: Of course it is obvious enough

that if this case could be determined upon the question of estoppel, that it would shorten it very materially. If it was obvious, as I said before, that the estoppel existed, why the court would not hesitate to so rule. But the first question that met the court would be right now whether you have proven an estoppel, in other words, a former adjudication that estops these defendants. It is true the court might send the defendant to their proof, if they desired to submit any. They might not desire to submit any. They might rely upon the insufficiency, from their viewpoint, of the proof of estoppel. I would want to hear it argued pretty thoroughly before I would be prepared to say that you have established an estoppel. There is evidence that tends in that direction, but whether it is sufficiently clear and definite enough sufficiently certain "to a common intent" as they put it,—you say you have witnesses that are not here?

MR. KREMER: That is what I meant by stating to your honor the other day that it was useless to take up the time of the court at present in arguing this matter.

THE COURT: What about your evidence in respect to that estoppel?

MR. KREMER: I have no doubt that Mr. Garrison's statement—

THE COURT: What I have in mind is, is your evidence here and available, if you intend to use it?

MR. KREMER: No, it is not. The question is whether we desire to use any or not use any. From this record as it is here submitted, we contend that

there is no estoppel shown. But if Mr. Hyde is available and I understand at this time that he is, a sharp issue will be then raised as to whether or not the statements here made are truthful. So we will proceed to make our statement, if your honor so desires.

THE COURT: Of course like in any other equity suit, if we proceed upon a record that might be fairly disputable and determine the question and let it go to the Circuit Court and possibly to the Supreme Court and comes back here for a new trial, I don't think it would be the best for either party or both parties. I imagine you are both anxious to have the record in such shape now that a final decision can be rendered in the upper court, in the appellate tribunal. I think it will make for a speedy conclusion of this case to allow the defendant to proceed at their discretion in the matter and the court will do so.

MR. GARRISON: I seek to reopen the closing of the case for the purpose of asking the defendant to produce from their New York or Duluth or other office the various vouchers and other matters which are not in Basin or Butte and which are called for in my notice to produce.

THE COURT: Well, it should be done during the course of the trial, if the trial continues long enough to enable them to do it. If they can do it I assume they can by correspondence. You were late with your notice to produce, but they will do that if the case continues that long and I assume that it likely will.

MR. GARRISON: We now close, with that reservation.

THE COURT: Let us first dispose of this proposed amendment to the answer. I find by examining it it proposes three publications not pleaded in the present answer if I remember right, two of which however are in evidence in the Hyde suit, the record of which is now in evidence here; and it also pleads perhaps some fifteen patents now in the present answer, one of which seems to be an Italian patent.

MR. SCOTT: The Italian patent corresponds to this British patent, and that is referred to in the Hyde case.

THE COURT: This amendment,—of course amendments are always allowed in furtherance of justice at any time where it can be done consistent with the rights of the other party. It, too, comes late, of course. And yet there might be in the condition of all this litigation an excuse. If the court can take judicial knowledge of it, unreasonable delay and neglect should not be charged against the defendant in proffering this amendment. The question would be of course whether the plaintiff is prepared to meet it. What about it? If it operated as a surprise, there is a serious question which ought to involve its rejection. If it does not, the state of the case is such, and of these documents and of the proof available to you, that you can meet it, the court desires to know it and if that is not the situation the court desires to know it. You have made an objection simply based on lack of diligence as I recall it and on the estoppel.

MR. WILLIAMS: On the estoppel, and not having then read the document, I find that there was an attempt to set up British application, which would be totally in violation of the statute, no application for a patent in England being of the slightest force and effect under the statute.

MR. KREMER: Well, just disregard that. Where does that appear? It can be eliminated by consent. We will eliminate it by consent.

MR. WILLIAMS: Lines 21, 22 and 23 of page 6.

THE COURT: Elmore British patent, 17816.

MR. WILLIAMS: The words on these lines, "F. E. Elmore obtained British patent No. 17816 of the year 1904 for the same invention and that said Elmore applied by said British patent August 16, 1904," the entire statement to be eliminated. The British patent in question was sealed long after our application date and the application has no force and effect.

MR. KREMER: We consent that it be eliminated—or I think more properly that we request that it be eliminated.

MR. WILLIAMS: Again on page 5, the same words, constituting lines 17, 18 and 19.

MR. KREMER: That may also be eliminated.

MR. WILLIAMS: Now, in regard to a number of patents that are set up, really not any patent at all, but applications for United States letters patent, appearing on the last page of the proposed amendment to the answer, I wish to note the general objection that the only force and effect that these, when proved, can have is upon the question of originality in the

identical invention of the patent in suit, and that that cannot in any manner be considered as part of the prior art. With that objection, now I see no reason why we should strike out the pleadings although as to the last patent in this list it appears that the date of application for United States letters patent was July 17th, 1906.

MR. KREMER: Strike it out if you want to.

THE COURT: What is that?

MR. WILLIAMS: F. E. Elmore, 826411.

THE COURT: What was the date of the patent?

MR. WILLIAMS: The date of application is July, 1905. The date of our invention is March, 1905.

MR. KREMER: Strike it out.

MR. WILLIAMS: And again on page 5 at line 16 the same patent, 826411.

MR. KREMER: That is the same.

THE COURT: That goes out?

MR. KREMER: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Now, as to the California journal of technology, we do not plead surprise. We litigated a case in Wilmington, Delaware, wherein that was one of the defenses. We know of the existence of such a document. I don't know that we have come here prepared to meet it, but I believe we may be able to do so. The ground of our objection to that is that it is a new defense and the ground of objection is estoppel.

MR. KREMER: Is that all, Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: That is all.

THE COURT: The objections will be overruled.

as to the amendment to the answer, and the amendment will be filed.

MR. KREMER: In conformity to the rule of court, I desire to submit an engrossed copy of the answer as made. That is the rule for the purpose of convenience. And I will ask permission to file this as soon as the amendments are made and it conforms to the matters stricken out by the court. That will be agreeable, and I will furnish you with a copy.

MR. GARRISON: Perfectly.

WHEREUPON the defendant made an opening statement to the court as follows:

MR. SCOTT: This patent No. 835,120, your honor, here in suit has been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States principally, if not wholly, upon the theory that there was what the court has referred to as a critical point. That has been the theory of all of the witnesses produced by this plaintiff from the beginning of this case; it has been almost the sole reliance,—the principal reliance of plaintiff's counsel in all of their argument and presentations of this case. It was the theory upon which the Supreme Court of the United States has sustained this patent. And yesterday morning was the first instance in which we had seen this wonderful critical point repudiated by counsel for the plaintiff. While the Supreme Court was prevailed upon to accept this remarkable theory of a critical point in the matter of the amount of oil in this flotation process, we are compelled, in view of the character of the evidence and the character of the arguments made by counsel before the Supreme Court, to come here

attacking the validity of this patent upon the theory that there is no critical point. So confident are we that the Supreme Court of the United States was misled by garbled evidence and arguments that misrepresented even that evidence, that we come here for the purpose of trying that issue of the validity of that patent once more. Now, there can be no question from the text of the opinion of the Supreme Court that the supposed existence of this critical point, so much emphasized by the witnesses for the plaintiff, and by the counsel for the plaintiff, was the foundation of the opinion by the Supreme Court. The fact that the Supreme Court declared claims 9, 10 and 11 invalid—the only three claims that did not specify this small amount of oil—is in itself convincing and conclusive proof that that was the foundation of their opinion. One of the closing expressions of the Supreme Court and one the meaning of which was invalidated in this disclaimer by having the passage taken from its proper context and put in another setting, is this: “The results obtained by the use of oil within the proportions often described in the testimony and in the claims as critical proportions, amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore.”

Now, a “critical point,” by every definition, popular, scientific or otherwise, is some point either in a physical change or in a mathematical conception where there is a transition, where one phenomenon changes to another. On this question the proposition has been advanced that when a certain point is reached in the reduction of oil we have the transition from a floating mass of mineral to a sinking mass, providing such quan-

tity is being raised, or if we follow the procedure dwelt upon so fondly by the witnesses for the plaintiff, the sinking is changed to flotation by reducing the amount of oil.

Referring again to this disclaimer, not that I am going to discuss that, but to illustrate and make clear the line of evidence which we are going to introduce. The gist of the disclaimer is contained in one expression: "He hereby disclaims from claims 9, 10 and 11 of said letters patent No. 835,120 any process of concentrating powdered ores excepting where the results obtained are the results obtained by the use of oil in a quantity amounting to a fraction of one per cent on the ore." Now, it takes close attention from me to follow the refined argument upon which counsel for the plaintiff here baldly tells the court that they are not disclaiming anything but they are enlarging their patent by this disclaimer. The proposition advanced is that they are entitled to the results obtained by the use of less than one per cent of oil, the implication being that if these results are obtained by the use of more than one per cent of oil they are still entitled to them. I think that is a fair statement of the idea that was put forth by them before this court. Now, that statement is absolutely inconsistent with any theory advanced by any one of the expert witnesses who have appeared for this plaintiff throughout this litigation. It is opposed to the decision of the Supreme Court and it is absolutely opposed to the representations made to the Supreme Court by counsel here present in their arguments which resulted in their patent being sustained. The very definition of the term "critical point" absolutely removes

the possibility of this patent being valid and the owners of the patent still being entitled to something which is done by the use of an amount of oil larger than the "critical amount." The whole foundation of this patent, the very words of their own witness, Dr. Chandler, is based upon this amount of oil, the critical amount. So we will assume that there is a critical amount here; and in a day or two we will prove to the court that there is not. But, as far as that—as this case—has gone, we will say that there is a "critical point." This phenomenon does not come into play, there is no froth until the oil is below that "critical amount." That is the whole theory and foundation of the decree of the Supreme Court as to the supposed validity of this patent. And if that proposition isn't true, that patent isn't valid, and every court that this case has been presented to by plaintiff has been deceived.

THE COURT: What will you do in connection with this Supreme Court's decision?

MR. SCOTT: I will explain that, how that comes about?

THE COURT: No, what shall we do?

MR. SCOTT: We will present evidence here that was not before the Supreme Court, evidence which we conceive would have left no doubt in the mind of the Supreme Court as to the absolute invalidity of this patent. We will present evidence in this court that counsel for the plaintiff assured the Supreme Court in the most emphatic terms could not be produced. Counsel for this plaintiff assured the Supreme Court, and we did not have the evidence to meet it because this

case was tried at so early a date, they assured the Supreme Court that any operation with over one per cent of oil was an impossibility, commercially, that it could not be done. They told the Supreme Court baldly that we, for the defendant, were there presenting tricks, shams, ledgerdemain; that we had done things in little machines on a bench that no man could duplicate in a mill, by which no man could concentrate ores and succeed; no one had concentrated ores in a mill with that large quantity of oil. And the evidence in the Hyde case was taken and the assumptions of these witnesses were accepted. And since these assumptions were made millions of tons of ore have been concentrated in the great mills of the United States with over one per cent of oil and in many instances showing even a greater efficiency, metallurgically, than previous operations with small amounts of oil. And we are convinced that it was assumptions of that character that led to the decision of the Supreme Court. And we conceive that we do not come here in vain to try this case with a view to having it ultimately reach the Supreme Court; and we do not conceive that the Supreme Court, with evidence of that kind before it refuting the solemn assertions made by these counsel who are here and who were there, will ever adhere to the decision then made.

So inconsistent is the position of this plaintiff in this court with its position in the Supreme Court of the United States that they do not hesitate to absolutely deny and repudiate what they told the Supreme Court in attempting to sustain their patent when they come here with the fear in their hearts that somebody has

made a successful process with over one per cent of oil. They told the Supreme Court, counsel here present, that their invention did not come into existence until you had below one half of one per cent. In answer to questions put by the court, by Mr. Justice McReynolds, where this invention came into being, counsel here present, in response to the question: "Do you have any invention at half of a per cent?" And counsel said, "It begins to appear remotely, but it begins to appear; at three tenths of one per cent it increases, and at two tenths this great inventive child was fully delivered. And they come into this court repudiating this assertion. And so if somebody said this thing would appear at one per cent they could come in and say, "They infringe our patent," after having told the Supreme Court in precise terms that their patent could not be infringed if the operator used over one-half per cent, they were so afraid they were going to fail to put over their proposition that they even desired this one per cent amended in the patent and consequently said, "Give us one-half per cent and we are satisfied." Now, they come back here and want more than one per cent in a disclaimer which enlarges their patent.

But at the risk of repetition, I want to put one proposition again that I think I briefly stated. We have litigated here based upon the evidence of experts, based upon the arguments of counsel to the effect that there was a "critical point." Now, I think we should have in our minds a sharp definition of a "critical point." I think I may say that 32 degrees Fahrenheit is a "critical point." It is where water freezes. Now it freezes

right at 32 or it wouldn't be a "critical point," if there was any variation about it. Pure water will freeze at 32 degrees Fahrenheit. Now, the Supreme Court mentioned this critical point. The Supreme Court did not say where it was, but they thought that a claim that merely called for a certain amount of oil was altogether too indefinite. That was like saying that water froze somewhere, some point; but they allowed this claim to be considered valid which called for a fraction of one per cent of oil; but the Supreme Court of the United States did not say that even one per cent was the "critical point." They avoided that. They said there was a critical point and in order to find out where that "critical point" was we look to the remarks of counsel, and they say somewhere at one half per cent, or below. But the proposition is it must be somewhere. And having put it there, to claim that anything infringes their patent above that "critical point" is to say there is no "critical point," because if there is a "critical point" that is passed—that is placed where one phenomenon changes into another and if you can get that same result with a larger amount of oil then there is no critical point. The very definition of a "critical point" is this deciding at what particular point, with relation to the amount of oil, you come to a point—a line where the phenomenon changes. Now, when they say that if anybody gets this result with more than that amount of oil, they are admitting that there is no "critical point," that there is no point where the phenomenon changes.

Now, as to the proposition as to whether there is a "critical point" or not we shall produce evidence show-

ing the absolute identity of these methods, identity in appearance, identity in metallurgical value and identity in the scientific and analytical explanation of their existence. We will show that in series such that no man can point out a critical line of demarcation between one phenomenon and another. Furthermore, we will show to the court that this Cattermole phenomena which I think perhaps the court remembers from the proceedings in the case some years ago, in which the mineral was caused to be sunk by a large amount of oil, the theory of this patent being that when you lessen the amount of oil that causes the metal to float instead of sink, as in this Cattermole process. We will take exactly the same mixture and will agitate it and cause it to float, and, without changing the mixture one iota we will cause it to sink, showing that oil has nothing to do with it. The whole theory of this case is a matter of manipulation, that it is merely a matter of how the thing is stirred up as to whether it sinks or floats. Not only that, but we will show the court, not only in experimental apparatus, but through the evidence of witnesses, we will show this court that commercial froths of greater metallurgical value are produced with larger amounts of oil, not only as great as this Cattermole process, but even greater.

The attempt made here to enlarge this patent by disclaimer, if one may use such a paradoxical expression, and it is the only correct expression, is emphasized throughout this record which is already before this court as a part of this case by stipulation, the Hyde case, and I refer to this because it will emphasize, I

hope, in the mind of the court, the force of the evidence which we are going to produce. Their expert witness, Dr. Chandler, started out with the proposition that the reduction of this quantity of oil was the foundation of this invention. Now, when we show the same phenomenon with amounts 10, 20, 40 times as great as the highest item with which they themselves have put forth in their definition of the invention, how can we believe there is any invention here? The thing is inconceivable. They had their chance as to how to define this invention. There was their patent. They put the facts and the evidence around it, and we go outside of these matters and find the same thing in the prior art. Dr. Leibmann has referred to the amount of the oil as "infinitesimal" and as "microscopic" and yet we have the plaintiff here in this very suit validating its patent so that it has a right in court by filing a disclaimer; which according to their confessed intention is not to comply with the Supreme Court and narrow their patent, but which, according to their statement made in court, is for the purpose of enlarging it beyond the thought even of the patent solicitor who drew it years ago or beyond the fond vision of the inventor. They now desire to include operations such as are to-day being carried on at the Butte & Superior Mining Company with amounts of oil greater than one per cent. The patent itself defines the amount as less than 1%. The Supreme Court has handed down an opinion, a decree based upon the very idea that the patent is confined to one per cent, and has declared three claims invalid upon that theory, and they come into this court to

maintain their standing in court, as they must, by filing a disclaimer, by which disclaimer instead of containing the patent within its proper bounds, by the very admission and claims of counsel, is intending not to comply with but to deceive the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has said your patent is restricted, and they say now, "Your honor, you meant to widen it despite your express statement to the contrary. Dr. Liepmann has said there was no froth over one per cent. With years of study this patentee, with all of these experts, say there is no froth over one per cent. And yet, if we make a froth with over one per cent they say "we invented that ten years ago."

A great deal is being made in this case by the plaintiff of the decree of the Supreme Court. I think I am entitled to show this court what kind of representations that decree was founded on. These are the representations made in arguing to the Supreme Court of the United States.

THE COURT: I don't think we should go into that.

MR. SCOTT: Must we accept the decree without the admissions that were solemnly made in court as the basis of that decree?

THE COURT: I think that decree is binding upon the same set of facts anywhere.

MR. SCOTT: But, for the meaning of the decree. The decree—there is no question as to the decree being binding upon the same state of facts. We are not going to present the same state of facts.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. SCOTT: We will present a different state of

facts and presenting that different state of facts, we think we should be allowed to show the record upon which—

THE COURT: If it should be when offering it then we will take it up and discuss it. I do not think it comes in the way of an opening statement by counsel.

MR. SCOTT: There is one point more that I wish to make in connection with the alleged disclaimer. There are two ways—I will take the liberty of explaining, although it may be familiar to the court—of changing a patent after it is issued. One is by a disclaimer, with which the court has become quite familiar in the last two days. The disclaimer is simply a way of amputating something from the patent, cutting something out of it; and the other way is by reissue. If the patentee through inadvertence, accident or mistake has claimed more than he is entitled to or has made some error, he is allowed to surrender his patent to the Commissioner of Patents and to apply for a reissue. Now, having done so, the Patent Office examines the patent over again in its entirety. They can take away from him that which he had in his first patent if they want to. And in case the patent is reissued there are no rights antedating the date of the reissue. Everything in the past is wiped out. He can collect nothing for damages for infringement prior to the granting of the reissue; and the reissue expires on the same date that the original patent would have expired on. Furthermore, we will assume that the patentee has not claimed his invention as broadly as he was entitled to and wants to reissue it in order to broaden his claim to in-

clude something that it would not have included in its original form. Now, if it so happens that before he applies for his reissue some third party, some member of the public actually manufactures this article or practices this process which he wants to include by broadening his claim, he is not permitted to do so unless he has filed his application before that member of the public does manufacture that article, or practices that process. If he does not apply for his reissue until after some member of the public has manufactured the article or carried out the process which he wishes to include, he is precluded from getting a reissue by what is termed "the intervening rights" of this member of the public. Now, in this matter of disclaimer the patentee meets no such obstacle. The very theory of the disclaimer is that he is giving something back to the public; therefore, there can be no intervening rights. At most he is giving the public something, and there is no possibility of the patentee taking more from the public than his original patent took. He is giving them some of his monopoly. In the second place, the procedure by disclaimer avoids a re-examination of the patent by the patent office. The patentee simply draws up this paper and files it in the patent office; no one looks at it, his patent is not examined because the theory of the thing is he is giving something up and he can be trusted to do that. Now, in this particular case here before the court, assume that the patent in this particular was not as broad as they wanted it to be, and that is what they have said already, that it was not; they want more than one per cent now. Their proper procedure would have been to apply for a re-

issue of their patent if they wanted to broaden it. It is the only procedure by which one can properly broaden a patent. But why was it objectionable to them to proceed by application for reissue? First, that at the time they filed their disclaimer thousands of tons of ore were being treated by the flotation process every day with over one per cent of oil. The intervening rights would have prevented any possibility of their getting a reissue. Second, the great lapse of time since they took their patent out, over ten years ago, would have been sufficient to prevent it. And, third, had they applied for a reissue the probability is that the patent office would have taken their whole patent away from them because the evidence which we shall present to this court will show that there was—we shall present to this court will show plainly that there is no boundary to this “critical point,” and immediately you go beyond the one per cent and the “critical point,” we arrive in the realm of the prior art.

Now, if there is still time this afternoon I propose to examine at least one witness.

MR. KREMER: We might save time by proceeding with some matters. Perhaps we can take up—

THE COURT: Proceed at your discretion.

MR. KREMER: We will ask Mr. Ballot to be sworn.

John Ballot.

JOHN BALLOT, called as a witness in behalf of the defendant, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. KREMER:

Q. 1. What, if any, position do you hold with Minerals Separation, Limited?

A. Chairman.

Q. 2. Chairman of the board of directors?

A. Yes.

Q. 3. What, if any, official position do you hold with a corporation known as Minerals Separation North American Corporation.

A. President.

Q. 4. What, if any, interest has Minerals Separation Northern American Corporation in the patent in suit?

A. They acquired the interests of the patent—

MR. GARRISON: That is expressed by writing which we will produce if they wish it.

MR. KREMER: It is immaterial to me how it is proven.

MR. GARRISON: We will produce all of the matters which have to do with the North American Corporation and Minerals Separation, Limited.

THE COURT: Is that satisfactory?

MR. WILLIAMS: They are not in my possession now, they will be in my possession this evening.

MR. GARRISON: We sent for them to New York.

MR. WILLIAMS: They are coming from New York. It takes three days.

John Ballot.

MR. KREMER: I think this question is proper.

THE COURT: He may answer.

Q. 5. What if any interest has Minerals Separation North American Corporation, in the patent in suit?

A. They acquired the interest of the patent.

Q. 6. What else?

A. They own the interest in the patent.

Q. 7. They own the interest in suit?

A. They do not own it in this sense, that it has been transferred to them, but they have acquired the rights to the patent.

Q. 8. The American rights to the patent?

A. The American rights.

Q. 9. Then, as I understand you, Minerals Separation North American Corporation, own the American rights to patent No. 835,120, the patent in suit?

A. They do.

Q. 10. When did they acquire the American rights?

A. December 7th of last year.

Q. 11. December 7th, 1916?

A. But no transfer has taken place of the patent. The parent company retains it as a trustee for the American corporation until this litigation is finished.

Q. 12. Minerals Separation Limited, then, is only the trustee?

A. The registered owner.

Q. 13. For Minerals Separation North American Corporation?

A. And registered owner.

Q. 14. But in fact Minerals Separation Limited own

John Ballot.

no American rights; Minerals Separation North American Corporation, owns those rights?

A. The beneficial rights.

Q. 15. Under the laws of what state is Minerals Separation North American Corporation, incorporated?

A. Maryland.

Q. 16. To refresh your memory, is it not a fact that all of the stock of Minerals Separation North American Corporation was issued in payment for the American rights to certain patents including the patent in suit, 835,120?

A. That is so.

Q. 17. That is the fact?

A. Yes.

Q. 18. And that issue of the stock was made when?

A. December 7th, 1916.

Q. 19. I present to you a copy of the Mining and Engineering World, of date December 30th, 1916, and turn to page 12 of that journal, and I ask you to state if, as president of Minerals Separation North American Corporation, you recognize that advertisement?

MR. GARRISON: I don't understand exactly the question, but I don't think it is worth while to object. If he means that they are responsible for the advertisement, that is another thing.

MR. KREMER: I can not ask that until he looks at it. He might say he never saw it before in his life.

MR. GARRISON: You can ask him the direct question.

John Ballot.

Q. 20. (Last question read.) Q. Do you recognize that advertisement as one that you had ordered inserted in that journal?

MR. GARRISON: With that addition I have no objection.

A. Yes, we are responsible for it.

MR. KREMER: We offer in evidence page 12 of the Mining and Engineering World, of date December 30th, 1916.

MR. GARRISON: That is objected to as incompetent and irrelevant to any issue in this suit.

THE COURT: What is the object, Mr. Kremer?

MR. KREMER: It is in connection with our argument that the disclaimer—and is evidence of unreasonable delay, in this: under the question of law presented to the court and argued solely as a question of law, there was considered only the question of unreasonable delay per se. There was no evidence showing the attitude of the holder of the patent at that time insofar as the public is concerned, in holding itself out as the owner of a valid patent. We offer this testimony, and I will offer other testimony of this character, for the purpose of showing that, under the circumstances of this case the delay of over 100 days, or 74 days, if you so choose to interpret it, was an unreasonable delay under the conditions, because the whole industry of mining in this country was laboring under the belief of the truthfulness of the representation that the owner of the patent was making throughout the length and

John Ballot.

breadth of the land—under the belief in that truthfulness—and if we can establish this fact, that these representations were being made, then there is positive evidence of the reason of their delay, and there is positive evidence of the fact that they were profiting by their unreasonable delay, and were practicing deception upon the public. What might be reasonable delay under one state of facts, becomes a most unreasonable delay under another state of facts, and this is a part of the chain of evidence, showing why this delay was unreasonable. Their patent was absolutely void through this whole period, because there had been no disclaimer filed, and that statement is borne out by the admissions here. It could only be cured by the filing of a disclaimer without unreasonable neglect and delay. Now, that is the purpose of this testimony, that is, the testimony of these advertisements. Of course it must immediately become apparent to your honor that the question with reference to Minerals Separation North American Corporation, presents still another question, which is not concerned.

MR. WILLIAMS: I might give you notice now. Mr. Kremer, that if we can prepare this evening, a supplemental bill of complaint, bringing in Minerals Separation North American Corporation, as a party plaintiff, upon the arrival of the train this evening, we will present such a bill tomorrow, but it may not be physically possible to do it.

MR. KREMER: Of course the evils of the day are sufficient.

John Ballot.

MR. WILLIAMS: I will read the advertisement: "The flotation process. All rights under this process in North America are now controlled by Minerals Separation North American Corporation. The Supreme Court of the United States having established the validity of the basic patent, for froth flotation, notice is given that the company is ready to grant licenses for the use of this process to those who wish to install and use it. To those who have infringed the patent, notice is given that a settlement for past infringement must precede the granting of license for the future use of the process. Notice is also given that the company will enforce its patents, and will stop all infringement." Then follows a statement about maintaining a laboratory where ores will be tested at minimum expense for prospective licensees. That is the substance of the advertisement.

THE COURT: Well, under the rule and promise of counsel that he has other evidence which, taken altogether, he believes will establish unreasonable neglect and delay, the objection will be overruled and the advertisement may go in. If it is not entitled to any weight when the court comes to render its decision, it will be given none.

Plaintiff excepted.

Advertisement contained in Mining and Engineering World, December 30th, page 12, is admitted in evidence marked defendant's exhibit No. 19.

MR. KREMER: I will offer another.

John Ballot.

MR. GARRISON: We will present that to Mr. Ballot, and if he says he authorized that, we will admit it.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 21. Was this authorized by you or your company?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. KREMER: This is in the Engineering and Mining Journal of date December 23rd, 1916, page 35. It is—

MR. GARRISON: It is admitted by counsel for the plaintiff that this advertisement was inserted by authority of Minerals Separation North American Corporation.

MR. KREMER: We offer it in evidence.

MR. GARRISON: We make the same objection. Objection overruled; plaintiff excepted.

Copy of Engineering & Mining Journal, of date December 23d, 1916, page 35, marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 20 and admitted in evidence.

MR. KREMER: I offer in evidence a similar advertisement included in the Salt Lake Mining Review, of date January 15th, 1917, page 55 of that paper.

MR. GARRISON: We make the same objection. Objection overruled; plaintiff excepted.

Page 55 of the Salt Lake Mining Review, of date January 15th, 1917, marked defendant's exhibit No. 21 and admitted in evidence.

John Ballot.

MR. KREMER: I offer in evidence a similar advertisement appearing in the Mining & Scientific Press, of date January 6th, 1917, being upon page 15.

MR. GARRISON: The same objection.

Objection overruled; plaintiff excepted.

Page 15 of the Mining & Scientific Press of January 6, 1917, marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 22 and admitted in evidence.

Q. 22. Mr. Ballot, approximately in how many journals, mining and engineering journals, did you cause that publication to be made?

A. Well, I cannot tell you that from memory.

Q. 23. Were there a great number or only a few?

A. Maybe six and maybe more, I would not say.

Q. 24. Over what period of time did that advertisement run?

A. I could not say.

Q. 25. Approximately.

A. Probably a month or two.

Q. 26. During the months of December, January and February, would you say?

A. I can not answer exactly; probably December and January—maybe two months, and extending into the following month.

Q. 27. Did you run it into February?

A. Very possibly.

Q. 28. Did you cause the publication to be run in any financial papers?

John Ballot.

A. It depends on what you call financial papers. If you name the papers to me, possibly I could remember.

Q. 29. For instance, the Boston News Bureau?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. 30. Did you cause that to be run during the month of February, 1917?

A. Yes, and probably longer.

Q. 31. I present you with a copy of the Boston News Bureau, of date February 21st, 1917, on page 10, and I will ask you if you caused that advertisement to be inserted.

A. I think so, yes, sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: We will admit that we did. It is the same advertisement.

MR. KREMER: We offer in evidence the advertisement appearing on page 10 of the Boston News Bureau of date February 21st, 1917.

MR. WILLIAMS: The same objection, your honor. Objection overruled; plaintiff excepted.

Boston News Bureau, of date February 21st, 1917, page 10, marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 23 and admitted in evidence.

Q. 32—Did you cause an advertisement to be run in the New York Commercial—I hand you one dated December 15th, 1917.

A. Yes, sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: We will admit that the company authorized the publication of this reading notice

in the New York Commercial, which is in fact and in substance, an advertisement.

MR. KREMER: We offer in evidence page 14 of the New York Commercial, of date January 15th, 1917.

MR. WILLIAMS: The same objection by the plaintiff:

Objection overruled; plaintiff excepted.

Page 14 of New York Commercial of January 15th, 1917, marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 24, and admitted in evidence.

MR. KREMER: I don't like to offer a letter of counsel. Will you admit that copies of this letter were sent to various people at the instance of the plaintiff?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, certainly. I did this as counsel for Minerals Separation, Limited, and Minerals Separation North American Corporation.

MR. KREMER: I offer in evidence a letter written by Henry D. Williams, dated January 30th, 1917, under the statement just made by Mr. Williams that he did it as counsel and at the instance of Minerals Separation, Limited, and Minerals Separation North American Corporation—

MR. WILLIAMS: That is right.

MR. KREMER: And that this letter was sent as a notice of infringement and claim of right. Is that correct?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. But I object to it on the ground that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial as to any issue in this case.

Objection overruled. Plaintiff excepted.

MR. KREMER: Attached to the letter was a copy of the opinion of the Supreme Court, and the other documents described in the letter. We offer those also.

MR. WILLIAMS: The same objection.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Plaintiff excepted.

Letter of Mr. Williams dated January ³~~10~~th, 1917, admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 25.

MR. KREMER: For the sake of brevity, will you not agree that similar letters and similar statements with similar enclosures were sent to a great number of mine and mill operators in the United States during the months of January, February, March and April, 1917?

MR. WILLIAMS: That is rather indefinite. If you will omit the word "great" I will accept it.

MR. KREMER: Will you substitute the number, Mr. Williams; I will call on you for that information, and your statements, off the stand, is all that we desire.

MR. WILLIAMS: I would say that, having learned that there were something in the neighborhood of 200 mines infringing the patent, we sent these notices to those mines. I think possibly the number exceeded 200, but that is the best of my knowledge and I will stipulate in the neighborhood of 200.

MR. KREMER: During the months that you mentioned, January, February and March, we will say?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, but not April.

MR. KREMER: Yes, I have got one in April.

Frank **R** Wicks.

MR. WILLIAMS: Have you? I see. And April, yes.

MR. KREMER: I think that covers that feature of the matter.

THE COURT: Very well, proceed.

MR. KREMER: I have engrossed the answer, under the rules, that where the amendment is offered it should be inserted in the original answer. I present a copy to counsel for the plaintiff. The document presented is the answer with the amendment included. Of course it does not include the supplemental answer, which I take to be a separate document, and did not engross it with the other. However, I have here a copy of that answer, and I offer this at this time, and ask that it be filed. Of course if counsel finds any error in it—

MR. WILLIAMS: Subject to correction it may be filed.

MR. KREMER: That may apply to both of us. Subject to correction for error, of course.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

THE COURT: It may be filed.

FRANK **R** WICKS, called as a witness in behalf of the defendant, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 1. State your full name, please?

A. Frank R. Wicks.

Frank R. Wicks.

Q. 2. What position do you hold at present?

A. I am at present assistant superintendent of mills for the Chino Copper Company.

Q. 3. Located where?

A. At Hurley, New Mexico.

Q. 4. What experience have you had in a general way in the duties of the kind you now perform?

A. I have been associated with milling and metallurgical companies for about twelve years.

Q. 5. And in a general way your duties are of what character?

A. During the first two years my duties were entirely clerical and mechanical. During the next five years they were both mechanical and metallurgical, because our organizations at that time were not very extensive. In the next three years I had supervision over mill operation, embracing all the departments of milling, and the same is true, though with a different company, in the last two years, which makes up the whole twelve years.

Q. 6. Have they a flotation plant in the mill where you are now engaged?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 7. Are you familiar with the operation of that flotation plant?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 8. Have you operated or had that plant operated under different conditions as to quantities of oil or other reagent ordinarily termed oil?

Frank *R.* Wicks.

A. Under a number of different conditions.

Q. 9. How do the results compare, with different quantities of oil?

MR. WILLIAMS: I object, your honor, to this testimony, first for the reason that having proved that an estoppel exists, that this defendant has had its day in court; that no evidence tending to show what can be done in the flotation operation, other than that of the defendant, and other than those that are within the issues in this case, is of any relevancy whatsoever. I make that the first objection.

Further, the Supreme Court of the United States having decided that our patent is a valid patent for a patentable invention, any attempt whatever to alter or attack the facts found by the Supreme Court, under the doctrine of *stare decisis*, is irrelevant and immaterial. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States applies to the fact that we have proved, establishing the infringement, because we have proved that this defendant has done just what Hyde did; and that this defendant did that before the commencement of this suit and after the issuance of our patent; therefore the facts in this case are the facts of the Hyde case, and upon those facts the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the patent is valid and infringed, and any testimony attacking the validity or the patentability of the novelty of the invention is an attempt to alter the state of the law as to the state of the facts which is before this court. The Supreme Court has held that under the state of the art the in-

vention was patentable, and the Supreme Court of the United States and the general law—the general patent law—is not concerned with things that have happened since the invention. Of what possible force and effect can the operations of the Chino Copper Company be in determining novelty? Because they are not of a prior art at all; they are within the last few months or years. We are dealing here with an invention that was made in 1905.

The third ground is that this is not evidence of anything that has the slightest bearing upon the novelty of the invention, the Supreme Court having decided as to the novelty and patentability of the invention.

MR. SCOTT: I think I have explained our position very fully in my opening, that the testimony which the witness is about to give is directed to the simple issue as to whether this patent affirms the truth in stating that a new phenomenon occurs and a new invention has been made when the quantity of oil is decreased below a certain amount, and I will perhaps elicit from the witness the truth regarding the effect of doing these things and doing them upon a milling scale. His testimony in that aspect would be similar to that of an expert who came in with the result of a laboratory experiment. The fact that his testimony will concern the operations in a mill, only renders it more relevant.

As to the Supreme Court having decided that this patent is valid upon the prior art, the Supreme Court did decide this case upon the prior art that was before the court; but there will be additional prior arts before this court and additional evidence before this court.

MR. WILLIAMS: There is not yet.

MR. SCOTT: The evidence is now being given.

MR. GARRISON: I only want to emphasize one point. It seems to me very clear that, the Supreme Court having decided, beyond the possibility of any doubt, that in the then state of the art this discovery was patentable, that any testimony as to what is done now—not under any prior art—with respect to flotation at Chino or any place else, is absolutely negligible, and immaterial and irrelevant.

THE COURT: Apart from the claim of estoppel, is not the issue open to trial, just the same as though the Hyde case did not exist, and the Supreme Court decision did not exist?

MR. GARRISON: I cannot answer that categorically. I will answer yes and no. My notion is this: Say we had a case of a will that was attacked in a suit for ejectment, we will say, between Jones and Smith, and the testimony was taken with respect to the testamentary capacity of the testator, and the case went to the Supreme Court of the state or the United States—the controlling court, and they held that with respect to the facts before them as to transactions with the testator prior to the making of the will they were satisfied that the will should stand, and that with respect to statements made by the testator after he had made the will, they were negligible and inadmissible. Now, we have another litigation in which the same will is brought forward between entirely different parties. We are not contending for one moment that it is not

absolutely proper in our suppositious case, to bring in everything that is relevant, which the controlling court has determined that is relevant, and everything that has to do with the then state of the art, at the time these people made their invention. Everything of that kind is relevant and material, but what occurred afterwards is not material. In our suppositious case, if any statement made by the testator before he made his will bears upon the question and is relevant and should be weighed and determined, and if new facts come forward of that kind they should be received and considered; but having once decided that the will should stand or fall by what could be proven that the man said or did prior to its making, and not after its making, that is the law of the case, and whenever that will comes up, every court should apply that law—that rule of evidence. It is relevant concerning that subject matter.

Now, we, in our own case, after the most careful consideration of the state of the art, have proven it before the court, which of course we cannot vary here. We do not maintain that it is not absolutely relevant for them to prove anything in that line—barring the estoppel—anything concerning the state of the art on which to base the claim that it is not an invention. When the Supreme Court said we are right, and applied the correct rule of law, namely, what was the state of the art at the time this invention was made—they found that at that time this invention was patentable. Now, to go forward and say they are going to vary that by showing what has happened since by using a greater quantity of oil or a less quantity of oil, can-

not affect this question. The Supreme Court said that in the then state of the art it was an invention, and we believe, even though you specify the amount of oil in their patent—they said you have a valid patent for that in the then state of the art. Now, is it possible that they should be allowed to bring testimony to vary that by anything that has happened after the time of the discovery and the time at which the Supreme Court determined that at that time it was a discoverable invention?

THE COURT: There are lots of cases on that point, probably. Has not that issue been up many times?

MR. GARRISON: In one way it could not have come up before, and in another way it may have been up many times. I am arguing apart from the question of estoppel, that that is the law of this case. We have to take the state of the art which the Supreme Court have used and they said "Under the then state of the art this was a patentable invention." I suffer somewhat under the same disability that your honor mentioned yesterday, of not knowing very much about patent office terms. They said "We determine that in the then state of the art that this was a patentable discovery." How can they possibly be permitted to put in testimony as to what can be done with greater quantities of oils or less quantities of oils or different quantities of oils subsequent to the date of that decision.

THE COURT: It looks as if it ought to be so. The question is whether it is so.

MR. GARRISON: I am arguing that it is so, and I leave it to your honor to say whether it is so. Mr.

Scott says frankly that this is all the evidence that he has got, but he is going to bring a vast amount of testimony as to what can be done by varying the quantities of oil, by the use even of vast quantities of oil.

THE COURT: He wants to show by new evidence and by inferences drawn from the former evidence that the conclusions arrived at were wrong.

MR. GARRISON: The Supreme Court reviewed the former evidence, and reached a conclusion that this discovery was novel, in the then state of the art. They say "We find that at the time the people made this discovery that the state of the art was such that this invention was discoverable."

THE COURT: Not what might have been done there, but the state of the art? Well, there must be cases. It seems to me that that issue ought to have been up in many cases.

MR. SCOTT: I don't think, in our view of the matter, that it is a question that requires citations. This witness who testified yesterday, it is exactly the same as any expert witness who would say I made an experiment last night. This experiment which this witness will testify about happens to have been made in a mill. Furthermore, the laws of nature are the same now as they were in 1905. We brought the results of experiments here with different quantities of oil in the Hyde case, and we were criticised because we did not have results of experiment in a mill. Now we have done it in a mill, and they still criticise, and when we have used larger—now we have done it in a mill, and still they criticise, though we have used a larger quan-

tity of oil. As to the prior state of the art, we are merely saying that what there was in the prior art, unknown to the Supreme Court, we should be allowed to show. What we desire to show is what can be done in a mill and what was done in a mill which this witness will testify about, and it is strictly connected with the prior art.

MR. GARRISON: They have not qualified him to testify about the prior art.

THE COURT: I know, but they want him to show by his testimony that what he has done now to strengthen their statement, that that was the prior state of the art, or that it could have been done under the prior art.

MR. GARRISON: I am perfectly fair with the court. I don't want any ruling to be made under a misunderstanding.

THE COURT: Certainly. We want this case tried so it will not come back.

MR. GARRISON: If Mr. Scott had proceeded with his witness, showing that they had done this or that at Chino or elsewhere with the amount of oil larger or different from those under our patent, that would be different. He has not done that. He has produced a gentleman who says he is from Chino, and that his mill has experimented with different quantities of oil. There is not a scintilla of testimony to show that it is under any prior art, and until that is shown, it seems to me that your honor is embarking on an immense field, which is not relevant. I think Mr. Scott should demonstrate first under what conditions of the

prior art this Chino experiment comes, and have the horse in the proper place, before the cart, not after it.

MR. SCOTT: I think the court can trust us to connect up our testimony. This witness knows about the matters about which we are talking.

THE COURT: Has the Supreme Court, in a case to which this defendant is a stranger, rendered an opinion—does that opinion establish the validity of that invention and the prior state of the art or the state of the prior art, so that it binds this defendant and other persons who want to litigate this patent.

MR. GARRISON: Provided nothing is added to the prior state of the art—yes, I can assert that.

THE COURT: Then I would like to hear cases, because if it is the fact, I think it will materially shorten this case. I will give you until tomorrow morning to present cases.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, April 18, 1917, at 10:00 a. m.

WEDNESDAY, April 18, 1917, 10:00 A. M.

Trial resumed pursuant to adjournment, all parties present; whereupon the following proceedings were had:

MR. GARRISON: The precise question under consideration at the hour of adjournment was whether a question addressed by Mr. Scott to the witness, Mr. Wicks, was, in view of the issues in this case and its present condition to be admitted. Mr. Wicks stated that for some twelve years he had been engaged in the business of mining and milling, and that for some five or six years he had been at a plant in New Mexico at the Chino Company. He was asked by Mr. Scott the following question: "Have you operated or had that plant operated under different conditions as to quantities of oil or other reagent ordinarily termed oil. A. Under a number of different conditions. Q. How do the results compare with different quantities of oil?"

And to that objection was made.

Your honor will recall that in the opening Mr. Scott very candidly and very clearly set forth what they proposed to prove in this case, and tendered this as his first witness to prove that which in his opening he stated they were going to prove. For the purpose of accuracy let us see just what issue Mr. Scott has tendered in this case, and the only issue. He says on page 190 of the transcript of testimony: "So inconsistent is the position of this plaintiff in this court with its position in the Supreme Court of the United States, that they do not hesitate to absolutely deny and repudiate what they told the Supreme Court, and in attempt-

ing to sustain their patent, when they come here with the fear in their hearts that somebody has made a successful process with over one per cent of oil."

On page 193 he makes it still plainer and says:

"The whole theory of this case (speaking of his own theory) is a matter of manipulation as to how the matter is stirred up; as to whether it sinks or floats. Not only that, but we will show the court, not only in experimental apparatus, but through the evidence of witnesses—we will show this court that commercial froths of greater metallurgical value are produced with larger amounts of oil."

He makes it equally plain on page 196, by saying:

"I think I am entitled to show this court what kind of misrepresentations that decree was founded upon."

So we have a perfectly candid opening. There is not a single proffer of proof in the opening with respect to the state of the art, not one scintilla of statement of the smallest microscopic quantity. He says, "We are going here to proffer proof that the results of the process in suit can now, we have discovered, be obtained by the use of greater amounts of oil."

Now, my contention yesterday, and the one for which your honor asked me to procure authorities was this: That where a court is determining the question of invention, it must look solely to the state of the art at the time the discovery was made; at the time the invention was discovered; and its patentability or lack of patentability depends solely and absolutely upon what the court finds the state of the art to have been at that time. That proposition is so well settled that I doubt if

it requires any citation of authority; if it does I can produce the authority.

My next proposition was that where a patent had gone to the Supreme Court of the United States, and that court, with respect to the then state of the art disclosed to it, had decided as a matter of law that invention was present, and patentability was justified—that decree—that finding binds all courts in this country upon the question of law, and binds all courts in this country upon the same state of facts, irrespective of who the party to the initial or subsequent litigation is; that is fully vindicated by authority.

The principle has even gone deeper and in the District and Circuit Courts of the United States wherever a patent has been investigated by any one of such courts and a subsequent trial between different parties discloses the same state of facts, the ruling will be the same. We find, rather remarkably, that this has even been raised and decided by a plea in *McCloskey v. Hamill*, 15 Fed. Rep. 750, Cir. Ct. Southern District of New York, February 19th, 1883. This is a bill in equity, recites the alleged infringement of letters patent No. 220,767. "This patent has twice been the subject of examination by Judge Wheeler in the Circuit Court for this district, *McCloskey v. Dubois*, and *McCloskey v. Dubois* and others. The facts which the plaintiff proved upon the second hearing are the same which he relies upon in this case. Judge Wheeler's opinion was that the alleged invention, which is the subject of this patent, is not patentable. That must be taken to be the law of this circuit until either a state of facts is proven which shall present a different case or until the con-

clusion of law upon the facts as now shown shall be overruled by the Supreme Court." The plea is sustained.

In the case of *Green v. City of Lynn*, 57 Fed. Rep. 516, 518, Circuit Court District of Mass., April 17th, 1893, Putnam, Circuit Judge. "Of course the findings of the Supreme Court in *Andrews v. Hovey* on questions of law are conclusive on all of the courts. The same is true as to its findings of fact, with reference to any other cause in which the court perceives that the facts are substantially the same as those which came before the Supreme Court. The reasons for this need not be elaborated, but this distinction is to be noted: That, when the parties are not the same in each case the determination of issues of fact by the Supreme Court do not operate strictly as *res adjudicata* or as a technical estoppel, but merely upon the conscience of the inferior tribunal."

And in *Beach v. Hobbs*, 82 Fed. Rep., 916, Cir. Ct. District Mass., August 23d, 1897, Putnam Circuit Judge, says: "A ^{decision} ~~doctrine~~ by the Circuit Court of Appeals in any circuit, so long as it remains unappealed from, and so long as the Supreme Court has issued no writ of certiorari to re-examine it, is to be regarded as having more effect in other federal courts than that ordinarily given to those of the highest state tribunal or other courts of merely concurrent jurisdiction. This is especially true with reference to a patent for an invention, when the state of the proof remains substantially the same. Yet, when the respondents are not the same, they are entitled to have the facts of their case

carefully scrutinized whether or not they present a different case from that adjudicated in the trial or litigation."

So, we now have gotten, with this brief resume of the situation, the fact that this defendant has not in this case produced any proof, proffered any proof or indicated what proof they propose relying on as to the state of the art at the time of the invention of the patent in suit. And yet they are proffering the testimony with respect to processes which, under the opening, can only have one course attributed to them, and that an immaterial, irrelevant and utterly incompetent issue to be tried in this suit.

Let us assume that they produce from Chino, from Ray, from Inspiration, from any other plant over which they have any authority to exercise control or with which they have any influence to produce witnesses, that they are by some process now, today, producing ore flotation with a greater amount of oil than that specified in the patent in suit. What of it? How is it relevant? How is it material? How can it possibly be taken into consideration by your honor in deciding any issue that is now before you or that can be brought before you under these pleadings?

Under the opening in this case, he stated that he proposed demonstrating to your honor that the Supreme Court of the United States had been deceived in the Hyde suit. I do not know to what he attributed the errancy of the District Court of the District of Montana who fell into the same error. I do not know whether he thought that court had been deceived or not

or fell through natural tendency, but he did say that "we propose showing that the Supreme Court was deceived in the Hyde suit." We do not propose petitioning in that suit, as the law requires we do, to have the court determine whether it was imposed upon. We propose coming into this court; we propose to ignore and set aside the only issues that we have a right to proffer here, and that is the state of the art demonstrating that this was not invention. That charge we do not propose meeting; that charge we do not propose offering. But they say: We do propose showing that now, today at Chino, someone by some process is producing ore flotation with a greater amount of oil than that specified in the patent in suit, an utterly negligible fact, an utterly irrelevant and immaterial fact.

Now, with respect to the authorities on that point: The Privy Council in the Minerals Separation case at page 1349 says:

"It is a general canon of construction, applicable to all documents, that the document should be construed as if the Court had to construe it as of the date of publication to the exclusion of information subsequently discovered. In patent cases the observance of this canon of construction has great importance. It is common, in such cases, to have a number of documents placed in evidence extending over a considerable period of time, each of which is relied on as disclosing relevant information prior to the date of the patent. If these documents required the assistance of experts to aid the Court in construction, the Court is deprived of the benefit of such assistance if the witness is asked to

read the document not in reference to what was known at the date of publication, but to knowledge only acquired at some subsequent date."

In the case of Tannage Patent Co. v. Donallan, 93 Fed. 811, 821, the Court said:

"With the Schultz process before him, it may be possible for a skilled expert to tan a skin by following what he believes to be a *liberal* construction of the Francillon specification, but that is not the question. Francillon is not to be interpreted in the light of and with the knowledge of the Schultz process. The question is, assuming the Schultz process did not exist, does Francillon disclose a tanning process, and by following *literally* his instructions have you solved the problem of a practical and commercial method of chrome tanning?"

Your honor, in the Hyde case, 207 Fed., 956, 961, said:

"The argument that the prior state of the art was such that to anyone skilled therein the process in suit at the time of its discovery was obvious may, under the circumstances, be well answered by the cases:

" 'Knowledge after the event is always easy. * * * But the law has other tests of invention than subtle conjectures of what might have been seen and yet was not.' "

Rubber Co. Case, 220 U. S., 435.

Expanded Metal Case, 214 U. S., 381."

In the Schmerts Wire Glass Co. v. Western Glass Co., 178 Fed., 977, 988, the Court says:

"Before attempting to construe it to see whether it was capable of operation, the legal rule governing the case may profitably be examined, to determine whether the Hyatt specification shows definite means for making wire glass. It may not be difficult, in the present state of the art, to read the Schmertz invention into the Hyatt disclosure; but could it have been done in 1874? No one ever succeeded in doing it, and this is some evidence, at least, that the description was defective. Was the original conception that of Hyatt or of Schmertz? By using twentieth century magnifying glasses, a nineteenth century method has been found efficient, which never was so before, and the immensely important point of view of an advanced art is thus unfairly used to discover an original conception never acted on or made anything of, and which never had any practical beneficial existence."

In *Naylor v. Alsop Process Company*, 168 Fed., 911, 920, the Court said:

"When it is sought to ascertain the state of the art by means of prior patents, nothing can be used except what is disclosed on the face of those patents. Such patents cannot be reconstructed in the light of the invention in suit, and then used as a part of the prior art. That, however, is precisely what the defendants attempt to do in this case in respect to the Frichot patent.
. . . Prior patents are a part of the prior art only by what they disclose upon their face. If they are carried into effect in the industrial world, what is learned from that experience also becomes a part of the prior art. An expert, however, cannot take a process patent,

which has never been applied industrially, and work the process in his laboratory, and discover therefrom something which is not disclosed on the face of the patent, and then transfer that experience back to the time of the patent, and make it a part of the prior art for the purpose of defeating a meritorious invention. That would be *ex post facto* law of the most pernicious character. Such a practice would be especially misleading in a case like the present."

Now, if your honor pleases, it seems to me that the issue now lies plainly before us. There can be no question, and of course we make no question, that it is open to the defendant in this suit to produce anything that lies within his own power, provided his pleadings justify it, with respect to the prior art. We contend, however, that under his opening, under the examination that he has so far made of this witness, it is perfectly apparent that his purpose is not to lay before this court the prior art or anything with respect to the prior art. He has laid no foundation for any such. What he proposes to do is to elicit from this witness, if he is able, and I have no doubt, having regard to his own ability, that he will do it, because he would not have put the witness on the stand otherwise, that by some process now in use at the Chino mill a result which he will claim is similar to the result of the patent in suit is obtained with a greater amount of oil.

And I assert without the slightest fear of being successfully refuted that that is absolutely immaterial in this suit or to any issue that is raised in this suit.

All that Mr. Scott himself says by way of justifica-

tion or excuse for his present method of procedure is: "I must be trusted to connect this testimony." But, if your honor please, orderly course of procedure is a matter of justice, except in negligible particulars. It is laid down for a wise purpose, to effectuate justice. To be sure courts have frequently and very ~~frequently~~ ^{properly}, where the matter makes no difference, permitted counsel to depart from the orderly procedure; to indulge for their own convenience some other method of proof than that which is the proper method and the proper order; but no court consciously does that in a matter whose inevitable result is absolute injustice to the other side. This method of procedure is, as to us, absolutely unjust and unfair. We are brought here with respect to this defense without the slightest suggestion in the opening as to any issue we are to meet that can be properly tendered by this defendant in this court at this time under the present condition of the law and pleading. We are asked to meet an issue that is immaterial and irrelevant, and that will be ruled out, we respectfully submit, by your honor, the very instant it is frankly and candidly attempted to be brought in.

THE COURT: Let me understand you. You rather seem inclined to concede now that they can proceed to show the prior state of the art was not what the Supreme Court thought it was. Yesterday you rather argued as though that could not be done.

MR. GARRISON: No, sir, no, sir; excepting as to the ground of estoppel—no; my language is right here. You said: "Has the Supreme Court in a case to which the defendant is a stranger rendered an opinion; does

that opinion establish the validity of the invention and the prior state of the art or the state of the prior art, so that it binds this defendant and other persons who want to litigate this patent?"

My answer was: "Provided nothing is added to the prior state of the art, yes."

That is still my position. My position is in this case—they—I concede that if they want to do that and begin by proper proof, to prove the entire state of the art from beginning to end, they can do that.

THE COURT: The court otherwise understood you yesterday.

MR. GARRISON: No, sir; what I was endeavoring to make clear yesterday was this, that until they produce in this court a different state of the art from that before the Supreme Court of the United States, the decision of that court will be followed by this court. Yet in the opening there is no proffer of producing the slightest alteration with respect to the state of the art. The only proffer is to show that now, today, they have discovered—or somebody has discovered that they can take greater amounts of oil than those specified in the patent in suit and obtain the same results. That is the only proffer of proof, and that is the only proof that they propose to show by the witness on the stand, in the question put to him. My statement is that it is proper for them to bring before the court all the proof that is proper under the pleadings with respect to the prior art. If they have done that, and there is nothing before the court that was not before the Supreme Court, the decision of the Supreme Court

finds in this case in the sense in which Judge Putnam stated, and if they do not do that, there is nothing here. and their testimony is immaterial and irrelevant in this suit or to any issue tendered by these pleadings.

Now, returning to the matter I was speaking of a moment ago, I was endeavoring to show your honor the injustice that would result to us by the present order of proof. This gentleman on the stand presumably will swear that at Chino, by a process larger amounts of oil were used than those specified in the patent in suit, and results—let us assume—like those in the patent in suit were produced. Where are we left? Can we intelligently cross examine that witness? Do we know with respect to what part of the prior art that is supposed to relate? We do not. Is there any way of our finding out? There is not. They have not put before the court the state of the art on which they propose to rely. We might spend hours and days cross examining that witness, and have Mr. Scott say “that is all waste of time, because we don’t rely on that prior state of the art; we rely on something that you were not astute enough to discover in relation to the testimony of this witness.” Can anything be a clearer demonstration of the propriety in this case of the orderly course of procedure? When these defendants have opened to your honor, as I think they should be required to do, what the state of the art is that they propose to rely upon, and when they have proven that state of the art, then it will be time enough,—and not until then—for us to be confronted with practical processes or with so-called experiments. At the present

time we are left in the position where, if this course of procedure is permitted, witness after witness will be put on the stand and will develop their theories without a possibility of intelligent cross-examination on our part, and later, undoubtedly, experts will be called, and they will put their finger on this or that or the other, and will give testimony that we cannot then intelligently cross-examine because they will know nothing of practical operation. They will be able by proving the wrong half of their case first, to deprive us of any intelligent opportunity to meet their case whatever, and I am quite sure that that does not make for the proper administration of justice, and I therefore respectfully submit that our objection is thoroughly well taken at this time, that under the opening of counsel and under the pleadings in this case, under the questions that have been addressed to this witness and answered and under the present question addressed to this witness, it can bring out nothing but irrelevant and immaterial testimony.

MR. SCOTT: If the court please, I must say that I am unacquainted with the practice in the jurisdiction from which my learned opponent comes, but it has always been my experience in the trial of a lawsuit that before the experts are called they ought to have the facts before the court to comment upon, and I have proceeded in what I conceived to be the natural and orderly course of procedure. We have not brought expert witnesses here to testify upon nothing; they must have the ground work of fact upon which to pass their opinions, and it was with that idea that I started my

presentation of the case with a fact witness. Furthermore, we have already a considerable mass of testimony in this case in the Hyde record, which is stipulated in here, and which will be supplemented by further fact evidence. The plaintiff here now has more information regarding what our case is going to be than is usual, simply by reason of the existence of this Hyde record which is stipulated into this case, and it is quite impossible, and quite out of order to put expert witnesses on the stand before we have any facts for them to interpret or comment upon or pass their opinions upon.

As to there being no issue tendered in this case, if Mr. Garrison would look at the pleadings, he would find the issues where they are usually to be found. He would find in them the issues set forth which we are going to present. He would find wherein the issues here tendered differ from those in the Hyde case. The testimony which the witness was about to give—and I do not admit that it was necessary it should be so—but it happens to be so by reason of this Hyde record—the testimony which this witness was about to give would have shown that in practical operation the processes of the prior art are practical and are profitable.

As to the statement advanced by Judge Garrison that the decision of one inferior court is binding upon another—one District Court upon another—one Circuit Court upon another—that is too absurd to be entertained a moment. Of course there is a certain comity between the different courts, but it is by reason of the fact that that comity is not always ruling that the

Supreme Court has entertained most of the patent cases which it has entertained, by reason of disagreement between the courts of different districts and different circuits.

I am not altogether clear as to the real ultimate analysis of Judge Garrison's position, but if he has any thought that there is any impropriety in this court entertaining a presentation of the full evidence in this case, it certainly will be removed by a simple consideration of two cases that I have brought with me, and from one of which I will read a paragraph. The first case is *Mitchell v. Tilghman*, 86 U. S. 287; 22 Law Ed. 125. In that case the Supreme Court of the United States held that a patent issued to Tilghman was not, as it purported to be, for a process, but was restricted to the particular apparatus disclosed, and therefore the case was decided against the patentee, and for the defendant below.

Tilghman in a later case sued Procter & Gamble, that case being commonly known as *Tilghman v. Proctor*—relating to the same patent. The case is found in the 102 U. S.—I haven't the page—and 26 Law Ed. 279. In this case the same patent was presented to the court; it was the second case involving the same patent. I will read one short paragraph.

"This case involves a consideration of the same patent which was the subject of litigation in the case of *Mitchell v. Tilghman*, reported in the 19 Wallace 287. The evidence in the present case, which is quite an unwieldy mass, is much the same as in the other, being supplemented however, by the testimony of the patentee

respecting the nature of his original experiments, and the practicability of using practically the coil apparatus described in the patent, together with certain exhibits relating to the novelty of the alleged invention.

“Upon the renewed consideration which has been given to the subject, the court is unanimously of the opinion, contrary to the decision in the Mitchell case, that the patent of Tilghman must be sustained as a patent for a process, and not merely for a particular mode of applying and using the process pointed out in the specifications, and that the defendants have infringed it by the process used by them.”

Now, as far as the relation of the first and second trials of these Tilghman cases are concerned, they are on all fours with the case now before the court. In the second case the Supreme Court said ‘the record is largely the same but supplemented by certain testimony’, and the Supreme Court decided in the second case contrary to that which they had decided in the first case. Now, where we find the Supreme Court entertaining such a record and then reversing its previous decision upon such a record, how can there be any question of the propriety of the lower court following the same procedure?

THE COURT: The argument this morning seems to be that you cannot introduce evidence of what you can do now, without any relation to the prior art?

MR. SCOTT: The evidence which I propose to introduce now is a duplication of the prior art, merely showing its practical application on a practical scale. The criticism was made in the Hyde case that all we

did was to show laboratory experiments representative of the prior art, and the Supreme Court was told that they were shams; that was the word.

THE COURT: This witness whom you have on the stand and by virtue of the question which you have proposed, and others, we will say, like it, are you proposing to show the prior art, and what can be accomplished by it?

MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. I will show by the matters which this witness will describe, as forming part of his practical operations, that each of those different steps is fully described as a step in the prior art, in fact the prior art is already in evidence in the Hyde case, although we will supplement and amplify that.

THE COURT: Proceed, Mr. Scott.

MR. SCOTT: As to the order of proof, your honor, I cannot conceive how I can examine expert witnesses without first putting these facts before the court.

MR. WILLIAMS: I merely wish to say that the facts which this witness will testify to are not facts of the prior art.

THE COURT: Now, he says they are, and we will have to assume that they are.

MR. KREMER: Your honor will have to determine that.

MR. WILLIAMS: He says that the witness will describe experiments performed at a time within the last few months. Now, how can they be facts of the prior art?

THE COURT: It might be. He will say that the prior art was thus and so then, and it could have been

done then, and as corroboration of that, I will show you that it can be done today.

MR. WILLIAMS: How are we to know what facts of the prior art these late facts can be linked up with?

THE COURT: Well, of course, a party may introduce evidence on many occasions where it is absolutely impossible for the other side to meet it, perhaps, but that would not go to its materiality at all; it would be simply your misfortune.

MR. WILLIAMS: Would not that be a misfortune imposed upon the plaintiff by reason of the order of proof not being the regular and proper order of proof? Now, one further objection, your honor, if your honor wishes to hear that before ruling.

THE COURT: Surely. I am going to hear you with the utmost liberality, both sides.

MR. WILLIAMS: The objection to the description by the witness on the stand here of experiments conducted by him at a plant in Chino, New Mexico, when no representative of the plaintiff was present, and which might or might not have been honestly conducted, with no opportunity on the part of the plaintiff to test the operation or its results—our objection is that such testimony of experiments is secondary evidence, and incompetent for that reason; ex parte experiments, done and completed without our knowledge and without opportunity for us to criticise and without opportunity for us to examine the operations. Now, it is peculiarly true that this defendant has a plant in Butte, Montana, within a short distance of the court house,

and that we are here; and if he wants to prove anything by way of experiments, which he says may illustrate the art as it existed twelve or more years ago, why he can produce those experiments in our presence and in the presence of the court, and then we may have some reasonable judgment as to what was done and how it was done. I therefore raise the objection that this testimony of this witness as to experiments performed at Chino is secondary evidence and incompetent.

THE COURT: With reference to the last objection, of course the court will take the circumstances into consideration in weighing the credibility of the witness and how much importance should be attached to experiments of that kind, out of the presence of the plaintiff, and of course to which it has had no access.

The objection made yesterday, the second, is:

"The Supreme Court of the United States having decided that our patent is a valid patent or a patentable invention, any attempt to alter or attack the facts found by the Supreme Court is against the doctrine of stare decisis, and is incompetent and immaterial."

I understood from some of the arguments yesterday that the Supreme Court having found the prior art to be so and so, that that could not be questioned in this case; but I take it from what counsel urged this morning in his argument, and in response to a question of the court, that they do not now and did not then assume that position.

The objection on the score of estoppel—former ad-

judication, in that this defendant was so related to the former suit that it cannot now question the validity of the patent—of course the court still has that in reserve. It is not satisfied from the evidence now to say that this defendant is bound by that decision. At this time, however, on that score, the objection is overruled.

The other portion of the objection going to the testimony of the witness in reference to experiments and practice at the present time—of course if it relates to something happening since this patent, and merely to what might be done now, it will be assumed that it is in the light of what this patent has given, and could have no bearing and no materiality in the case. I think that is made plain by all the cases.

In the matter of counsel's opening statement, it is somewhat of a practice not to criticise it if counsel in the opening statement indulged somewhat in oratory. I do not believe that they can be held—neither they nor the plaintiff—to have fully set out their case in the opening statement, or what they expect to prove. There are cases, or have been, where counsel is held strictly to his opening statement, and upon his opening statement he may be nonsuited if he was the plaintiff, and if he was the defendant it may be ruled that he had no defense. But that has never been the practice here, and I do not believe that it is very favorably considered anywhere any more. Now, the defendant, in proffering this witness says that he does propose by this witness to show the state of the prior art, and what might be done with and under it, and if he proposes

that, of course he has a right to show what it was then; and to corroborate it by what could be done with it now. He says that is his aim and purpose. I think if that is true, it meets the main objection of counsel for the plaintiff. Certainly it is permissible to prove as a circumstance that a thing can be done now—to prove as a circumstance that it could have been done before. If that is all that counsel is aiming at, the court thinks it is admissible.

As to the order of proof, I cannot see that he is proceeding at all out of the proper order, if that is his purpose, to show the former state of the art, and to apply it to what he claims is being done now. In a case like this, a case of such large importance and where the issues are to be so strenuously contested, it is inevitable that the testimony and the evidence will cover a very wide field, and also it is inevitable that some will creep in—considerable will creep in that might not be strictly relevant or material and not strictly in proper order. But the court thinks that when it comes to render its decision, that all this testimony, insofar as it is material will find its proper place, and what is immaterial will probably be excluded, and the court has heard what counsel has said about these experiments. That same question arose in the Hyde suit, and has been commented upon by the Supreme Court of the United States, experiments by one party out of the presence of the other, and to which the other had no access—they may not be entitled to very much weight, but that again is a matter for determination in weighing the testimony and determining the credibility, and not to exclude it as immaterial.

Frank B. Wicks.

The objections will be overruled.

MR. WILLIAMS: The plaintiff requests an exception.

THE COURT: Let the exceptions be noted.

MR. GARRISON: Just another word. If it shall appear at the conclusion of the direct examination of this witness that for any reason, or for no reason, his testimony is not so referred to the prior state of the art as to direct our attention thereto, we will ask the right to postpone our cross examination of this witness until the connecting testimony is given.

THE COURT: You have always that right, and you have always a right to make motions to strike any testimony that on examination appears to have no place in the record. Recall your witness.

MR. KREMER: That is purely a matter for the discretion of the court.

MR. GARRISON: He has ruled.

Q. 10. MR. SCOTT: Mr. Wicks, I will repeat in substance the question now upon the record: Have you in the operations of the Hurley plant of the Chino Copper Company, used various quantities of oil or oily reagent?

A. We have.

Q. 11. Have your operations involved any comparison of the effects obtained by a more and greater amount of oil?

A. Well, we have prepared certain comparisons, as much for our own information as anything else,

Frank B. Wicks.

to show the relative effects of the various quantities of oil.

Q. 12. You have before you, have you, a statement of such a comparison?

A. I have.

Q. 13. Covering what period of time?

A. I have a statement here covering the operations of one plant from December 8, 1914, up to December 20, 1916, compared with the same plant from December 21st, 1916 to March 31st, 1917, that division being made because of the marked difference in the operations before and after that date.

Q. 14. That is, a division was made at the end—

A. (Interrupting) at the end of December 20th.

Q. 15. Between December 20th and 21st?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 16. Now, before December 20th, how were the operations conducted as to the amount of oil used per ton of ore?

A. Well, the operations were conducted in relatively smaller amounts of oil during the major part of the time. There wasn't any great regularity about it, but the quantities of oil varied from a minimum of 1.48 pounds per ton during the third quarter of 1915, up to a maximum of 23.7 pounds per ton which occurred in November—in the middle part of November, 1916.

Q. 17. What days of November was that?

A. November 18, 19 and 20, three consecutive days.

Q. 18. On these three consecutive days the amount of oil was 23.7 pounds per ton?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 19. Is that figure an average for three days?

A. That is an average for three days.

Q. 20. What was the purpose in using that quantity of oil at that time?

A. Well, necessity, in order to produce results.

Q. 21. Well, just amplify that a little "in order to produce results."

A. That is this quantity of oil was used by the operators in the plant to produce a satisfactory recovery and a satisfactory grade of concentrates.

Q. 22. And at that particular time what would have happened or what did happen with a smaller amount of the particular kind of oil then being used?

A. On this particular day?

Q. 23. Well, what would have happened to the results with a lesser amount of oil than as specified upon these particular days?

MR. GARRISON: I object. I do not see how this witness can speculate if something had taken place other than what did take place.

MR. SCOTT: I will withdraw the question.

Q. 24. ~~What~~ *Was* the kind of oil used upon November 18th, 19th and 20th 1916, ever used in a lesser amount than 23.7 pounds per ton?

A. May I ask you to repeat that question?

(Question read.)

A. Yes, that same kind of oil was used in lesser amounts.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 25. And with what result as to the efficiency of the operation?

A. Well, with somewhat poorer results. Thinking of the third quarter of 1916, during which we used 8.7 pounds per ton, and the recovery obtained during that third quarter was 96.7 as compared with a recovery during these three days which I have mentioned of 98.4.

Q. 26. And how did the amount of copper in the tailings compare?

A. During the third quarter of 1916 the average tailing for the three months was .306. During these three days the tailings averaged was .244% copper or .062% copper lower by the use of a larger quantity of oil. I would also point out that that was accomplished on a somewhat higher grade ore which of course would ordinarily tend to a higher tailing loss.

Q. 27. Can you state what—or at least in a general way—what oils were used during the period from December 8th, 1914 to December 20th, 1916?

A. We used a tremendous variety of oils. I have a complete list of them but it will take some time to go through that.

Q. 28. It will not be necessary to have a complete list, but if you can indicate in a general way what they were.

A. Just a minute I can.

MR. SCOTT: I may say to the court that the purpose of offering this statement in evidence is for the

Frank B. Wicks.

convenience of the court and opposing counsel, I am perfectly willing to furnish copies at this time in order to enable the testimony of the witness to be better followed.

MR. GARRISON: I don't understand he offers it to have any probative force, but merely as illustrative of the witness' testimony. Am I correct in that?

MR. SCOTT: The witness will verify it and another witness will verify the report.

THE COURT: He will supply you copies if you desire. I do not believe the court will care for any now.

A. Going back to my earliest record we used pine oil—it don't say what kind, and a certain creosote, California crude oil, and various combinations of these different oils or various mixtures of these different oils. That was during January of 1915. Then, taking up the next month we used this same combination with the addition of a Texas crude oil.

Q. 29. Were these oils used separately or in a mixture?

A. Both. Sometimes we added each oil separately in order to regulate the proportions of the oils according to the characteristics of the oil and at other time we made up mixtures. For instance, in March of 1915, among the different oils we used, we used an 80% California crude oil and a 20% pine oil. That was used in combination with some creosote, but I am not able to say from this sheet what proportion of the mixture and the creosote we used.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 30. That is, you used the pine oil and crude in a mixture with some creosote?

A. We used the pine oil and crude as a mixture, that is, being made up in a mixture and fed from one tank, while in another tank we supplied the creosote.

Q. 31. But all three came together?

A. All three came together in the pulp. It is rather difficult to pick these oils out. Calling attention to the new names, we used Oklahoma crude oil in a number of different proportions; Texas No. 4 oil made up in a mixture of 70% Texas No. 4 oil and 20% creosote oil and 10% pine. Is it necessary for me to mention each month as we go down?

Q. 32. I think not. If those that you have stated are representative.

A. Do you wish me to take up any of the more recent practices?

Q. 33. Well, we will come to that later. Now, these operations extending from December 8th, 1914 to December 20th, 1916, were these actual mill operations for profit, or experiments?

A. Oh, those were regular operations.

Q. 34. You might name the tonnage treated during that period, extending down to December 20th, 1916.

A. From December 8th, 1914, to December 20th, 1916, a little over two years we treated 201139 tons or an average of 272 tons per day. I think the average per day will not quite agree with the total tonnage because of the plant being down at times, for a short time. I am not certain as to that, however.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 35. Now, subsequent to December 20th, 1916, what change was made in the operation of the Hurly² plant?

A. Well, we began using, on December 21st, we began using continually a quantity of oil greater than 20 lbs. per ton.

Q. 36. Will you state, for the different intervals after December 21st, how much oil per ton was used?

A. From December 21st to 31st we used an average of 24.57 pounds per ton. That was for 11 days. Then, for the month of January we used an average of 21.10 pounds per ton. In February we used 21.70 pounds per ton, and in March we found it necessary to use 23.73 pounds per ton.

Q. 37. And the average for the entire first quarter of 1917?

A. The average for the entire first quarter of 1917 was 22.18 pounds per ton, and the average for all operations from December 21st, 1916 up to the date of this report, which is March 31st, 1917—at least, that was the date when the figures were closed, was 23.38.

Q. 38. Was that 23.38?

A. Pounds per ton.

Q. 39. Were these operations with over one per cent of oil subsequent to December 21st experiments or actual operations in a mill for profit?

A. They were actual operations performed by the regular operators.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 40. And will you state what tonnage was treated from December 21st to March 31st, using over 20 pounds of oil per ton?

A. We treated during that period 22,536 tons.

Q. 41. When the change was made from a lesser to the greater quantity of oil, from December 21st, 1916, was the kind of oil changed, or were changes made in the apparatus, or method of operating the apparatus?

A. There was no change in the apparatus or in the method of operating the apparatus at all. The only change was that we began using a larger quantity of a somewhat cheaper oil and a lesser quantity of the more expensive oil. In these records—

Q. 42. (Interrupting.) You are going to state, are you, the oil mixture which you used after the increase in amount; that is after December 21st, 1916?

A. I think I can give it. Before the change was made we were using a combination of Barrett's No. 4 oil, which is a coal tar creosote or generally understood to be a coal tar creosote, and an oil known as the Jones flotation oil, which I think is a Kansas fuel oil. Now, we were using that in approximately the proportion of 90% Barrett oil and 10% Jones oil.

Q. 43. That is, with the smaller or the larger amount?

A. With the smaller amount.

Q. 44. Before December 21st?

A. Using approximately 90% of the Barrett oil, and

Frank B. Wicks.

about 10%, I think, of the Jones oil. When we began using the larger quantity, the proportions were almost exactly reversed; that is, we began using only 10% of the Barrett's oil, and about 90% of the Jones. Of course in our operations the character of ore fluctuates a little and these proportions are not absolute from day to day. The operators are allowed some discretion as to the proportions.

Q. 45. Was there any other oil used besides the Barrett and Jones?

A. We used a little pine tar; I don't know the proportion or the quantity, but we have always used that to a very limited extent. That applies both before—That is both during the first 20 days of December and during the last eleven days also. There were eight days during the first twenty days of December, during which they had to use a little pine tar.

Q. 46. That was with the small amount of oil?

A. That was with the small amount of oil, and there two days during the last eleven when they found it necessary to use the pine tar.

Q. 47. Did you operate at any time without the pine oil?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 48. Simply with the Barrett and the Jones?

A. Yes, sir; both before and after.

Q. 49. Is the use of the pine oil exceptional or general?

A. It is rather exceptional. It is necessary sometimes; we do not know why.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 50. How did the recovery of metal and the grade of concentrates compare after December 20 and before? That is, with the large and small amount of oil?

A. Well, taking all operations up to and including December 20th, 1916, a little over two years, our average tailings loss in that plant was .48% copper, and the average recovery was 95.528. The average tailings loss for all the period subsequent to December 20th, that is, beginning with December 21st, 1916, was .32% Cu. or .16% Cu. lower than the operating average up to that time; and the recovery for that last period in question was 96.936% or approximately 1.4% higher than the average operation up to that time.

Q. 51. In view of the figures as to the recovery and tailings which you have just stated, are the operations with larger amounts of oil subsequent to December 20th more or less profitable than the operations prior to December 21st with smaller amounts of oil?

A. I haven't the figures here but I have figured it a number of times and I am quite confident that the operations with the larger quantities of oil are considerably more economical, that is, are considerably more profitable, taking costs and the results both into consideration.

Q. 52. In giving your testimony, you have referred. I believe to a written report. Is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 53. And this report, a copy of which you have

Frank B. Wicks.

in your hands, will you state under whose supervision these operations were carried on?

A. These were carried out under my direct supervision.

Q. 54. And this—And state whether this report was your report, in your official capacity?

A. Yes, sir, it is.

Q. 55. And you know this report to be correct, do you?

A. Yes, sir. I have one of the original reports here and I compared it personally with that so as to be sure that it is all right.

MR. SCOTT: I offer in evidence the report which the witness has referred to in giving his testimony.

MR. GARRISON: May I ask one question before it is admitted?

THE COURT: Yes.

EXAMINATION ON VOIR DIRE,
BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 56. I understood you to say in answer to a question on direct examination that all of the operations shown upon this paper, which dates from December 8, 1914 to March 31st, 1917, that all of the operations between those dates were carried on by you or under your direction. Is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 57. So that you are able to tell us, of your own knowledge, with respect to every operation between those periods?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Well, I was absent from the plant for about six days I think, but I had access to the original reports; and, in discussion with the operators, I have every reason to believe that they are absolutely right because they in no way differ from those results which were obtained during my presence here.

Q. 58. All I want to know is whether you now accept the responsibility with respect to the operation between all these dates, so that when we come to ask you about them you will not say, "I don't know about that operation; I am not the one that you should ask about that operation." You have said all of these were carried on by or under your direction, but if that is not true that is one thing; if it is true that is another.

A. Under my direct supervision.

Q. 59. Does that mean that you are able now, in response to questions, to tell us with respect to each of the operations shown upon this, from the 8th of December, 1914, to the 31st of March, 1917?

A. Perhaps I don't understand you. You want the period first in—I thought you were discussing this period of December 2nd to March 31st.

Q. 60. Now you were asked whether all of these operations about which you had been testifying were carried on by you or under your direction?

A. Well, I may have to correct that. The operations from the first of May, 1915, were carried on under my direct supervision, because I did not go to the Hurley plant until May of 1915.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 61. Now, from May, 1915, to March 31st, 1917, is it the fact that you have personal knowledge with respect to the matter discussed upon this paper so that, upon cross examination, you are the one who should be asked and can respond to the particular operations? Is that correct?

A. Within the limits I have now made, yes, I think so.

Q. 62. But your knowledge should be complete because you were the person who had complete knowledge; isn't that correct? I am not talking about your memory now; I am talking about your knowledge.

A. I believe I have about as complete knowledge as anyone.

Q. 63. That does not quite answer my question. We do not want to be left in this position: "Yes," you say, "I know all about this" and we admit that paper with that understanding and then when we ask you, have you say "Oh, no, I don't know anything about that; that is outside of my domain." That is what I am trying to elicit from you. Was that all under your knowledge and are you the proper person to be asked concerning the verity of everything shown on that sheet?

A. All of these operations were conducted under my direct supervision and I had at least as much knowledge as to the results and the methods and so on as anybody ordinarily has when they supervise a plant of that size.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 64. Well, sir, you don't quite answer my question. What I want to know is this:—You can see I am not trying to trap you or anything—I simply want to know whether you are the person from the Chino Company and of whom we should inquire if things which are shown here correctly represent what took place or did not take place.

A. Do you want me to say I am the only person—

Q. 65. I don't want you to say anything but the truth, sir.

A. As I understand your question, I have answered it that I had, I believe, as complete knowledge of these operations and can answer questions just as intelligently as to the operations, as anyone.

Q. 66. Well, have you broad enough knowledge to say whether the facts and other things that are on this sheet correctly represent the facts as they took place at the time that they are purported to have taken place?

A. I think I have.

MR. SCOTT: I will ask, if the court pleases—

MR. KREMER: We want to eliminate three or four lines.

MR. SCOTT: Before the offer is passed upon, to eliminate from this report the first three lines, that is the part from December 8th to 31st, 1914, the first quarter of 1915, and the second quarter of 1915, in view of the witness' statement that his supervision began in May, 1915. And, with that amendment of the report, I will renew the offer.

Frank B. Wicks.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

Whereupon the report was admitted in evidence and marked defendant's exhibit 26.

MR. GARRISON: Now, I move to strike out of this witness' testimony all operations prior to May, 1915, when he says his knowledge of the situation began.

MR. KREMER: We consent that that be done. We have eliminated them from this report, everything prior to the time Mr. Wicks took charge.

THE COURT: The motion will be granted.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 67. Referring to this same period of time, what was the nature of the material being treated by flotation?

A. This material was—what is ordinarily known in our plant as the slime vanner concentrates.

Q. 68. And just what is that, in simple terms?

A. In our plant the material is treated on vanners and given a rough concentrating on the vanners or on all the vanners of the plant, and then the finer portions of that vanner concentrate is retreated in this flotation plant under discussion.

Q. 69. The finer portions?

A. The finer portions, yes, sir.

Q. 70. Classified somehow?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, it is classified in hydraulic classifiers and the coarser portion is treated on tables while the finer portion comes to the flotation plant.

Q. 71. Can you state approximately the degree of fineness of this material treated by flotation, as set forth in this exhibit 26?

A. I have no screen analyses to show, because the material is so fine that a screen analysis does not show up anything; but those that we have taken show approximately 90% of the material passed 200-mesh, but of course it is still coarse enough to be granular, or partly so.

Q. 72. Do you treat material of any different nature by flotation at the Hurley plant of the Chino Company?

A. We also treat the vanner tailings by flotation, that is, the slime portion of them.

Q. 73. Now, if you can, will you state the quantity of oil that you have used in the different parts in treating these vanner tailings?

A. Well, up to date, our records show that the average quantity of initial oil used was 1.13 pounds of oil per ton of material treated.

Q. 74. THE COURT: How much was that?

A. 1.13 per ton; that is, one and thirteen-one hundredths pounds per ton.

Q. 75. MR. SCOTT: I would like to ask the witness if he has some extra copies of this. I think I will verify it in the same way as the other report, and

Frank B. Wicks.

I think it will be more convenient for the court and counsel to have this before them even before it is formally offered.

A. I have three copies.

THE COURT: What is this?

MR. SCOTT: This is a different one, on different material.

Q. 76. You stated, I believe, that up to date you have used 1.13 pounds of oil per ton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 77. That is an average covering what period of time?

A. That is an average covering all operations since the 16th of April, 1915, up to the last of March of 1917.

Q. 78. Have you any figures showing the period in which large amounts of oil were used separate from the period where small amounts were used?

A. We segregated certain days, for illustration, during which we used various quantities of oil.

Q. 79. That is the tabulation that appears at the lower part of this sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 80. I notice that you have used as high as 37 pounds of oil per ton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 81. What kind of oil was that?

A. That was a combination of a coal tar with what is known as a stove oil.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 82. Just those two alone and nothing else?

A. Well, we used a minute quantity of Barrett's No. 4 Creosote oil in conjunction with that, but it happens that this does not show that.

Q. 83. Have you any information as to the part these various ingredients of the oil mixture play in the process?

A. You mean—I don't think I understand your question, Mr. Scott.

Q. 84. Your statement is that you have used a mixture made up of several different oils?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 85. And the question was as to what part each of these ingredients played.

MR. GARRISON: That is not the question. The question was whether he had the information. If he says he had, we are entitled, before he gives it, to ascertain the source of it.

Q. 85½. MR. SCOTT: Well, state if you have any information on the subject.

A. Yes, sir; I think our experience has given us information on that.

Q. 86. And state, so far as you know, what the effect or function of the different ingredients is.

A. The function of the coal tar is to—well, that acts as the major oil or the collecting oil, if you like. The stove oil, while it probably had some effect in accomplishing flotation, it was also beneficial in diluting this coal tar to the point where it could be fed

Frank B. Wicks.

into the plant regularly and measured accurately and so on, on account of the consistency of the coal tar, it is rather difficult to handle it alone, even at high temperature. The Barrett oil, I think probably, acted in the formation of the froth to a certain extent, or what is known ordinarily as frothing oils.

Q. 87. Have you any information as to how either one of these ingredients would have acted without the other and in quantity equivalent to that which it was used in the mixture?

A. Yes, I think we have. If you will permit me I might state one instance in connection with our runs.

Q. 88. You may do so.

A. During one of these tests; I can't identify just which one, but I think it was the one of March 27th—

Q. 89. 1917?

A. 1917, which is the fourth one from the bottom on the tabulation, during which we used 32.27 pounds of oil per ton, we used there a combination, or rather we used an oil which we called the Taft oil—it happens to be shipped from Taft, California,—and we used with that a very small quantity of Barrett's No. 4 oil. During that test which represented—or during that run which represented the length of time that the oil lasted, the length of time that the supply lasted, we watched the operation very carefully and I was present on the plant a good many

Frank B. Wicks.

hours and I remember that we had been operating steadily for four of five hours and I was up on the flotation machine and the results that the machines were producing were very satisfactory. They were just about as good as we thought we could make them and there wasn't any particular alteration or adjustment being made, and within a minute or two minute's time the ~~fo~~th apparently disappeared right off the surface of the machine and the separation of the finer particles ceased, practically—there were some, but practically none. And so I sent one of the operators down immediately to find out if there was anything wrong in the apparatus below, and he came back and told me that the only thing that was wrong was that the pump which had been pumping the large quantity of that Taft oil, had had to be shut down to have the steam end of the pump packed.

Q. 90. What oil was that pump pumping?

A. That was pumping this heavy Taft oil which we were using in large quantities. Well, of course, I went down right away and watched them until they started to pump again, and in the meantime to satisfy my curiosity, I made sure, personally, that the Barrett No. 4 creosote oil, which was being used in minute quantities, was still being used, and which was being fed independent of the other, in the ordinary manner, was still going into the plant. And so, as soon as the pump was started again I made sure that the correct quantity of oil was going in, that

Frank B. Wicks.

is the quantity that we had had on before, because we had good conditions before, was going in, and I went back in the plant and the conditions came back, the same general appearance, that we had before, with absolutely no other change.

Q. 91. Do you remember about what proportions the Taft oil and—what was the other?

A. The Barrett No. 4 creosote.

Q. 92. Barrett No. 4 creosote, were present on that occasion?

A. I don't think we used as much as one-tenth of a pound.

Q. 93. One-tenth of a pound?

A. Yes, sir, per ton of ore.

Q. 94. That has been the customary amount for you to use?

A. No, that is much smaller than the customary amount.

Q. 95. But upon this particular occasion, I mean?

A. On this particular occasion we found it necessary to cut down the Barrett No. 4 creosote oil to that amount to get the correct frothing condition in the plant.

Q. 96. When you talk of a correct frothing condition, precisely what do you mean?

A. Well, what appears to be correct to one operator of course would not appear to be correct to another, but the condition where the concensus of opinion of all present is that we are getting about the best results, just by visual tests.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 97. What can you say as the absence of a froth with different amounts of oils?

A. It depends on the oils you use, but as a general rule the froth is more abundant with the larger quantities of oil than it is with the smaller quantities.

Q. 98. Does the increase in the quantity of froth ever become objectionable?

A. It does at times.

Q. 99. And what steps are taken at such times?

A. In such a case you either change the oil combination or cut down the quantity of oil.

Q. 100. In treating this slime vanner tailings, was it necessary to make a change in the apparatus or any change in its mode of operation when increasing the amount of oil on January 7th and subsequent days?

A. Well, so far as the actual mechanical equipment was concerned, we made no mechanical changes; that is, so far as the use of apparatus or anything of that kind is concerned, we made no change, but we discovered that we got better results when we used the larger quantities of oil, if we decreased the amount of primary agitation.

Q. 101. To decrease it?

A. Yes.

Q. 102. By preliminary agitation, you mean just what?

A. What we ordinarily term the emulsification in the emulsification plant; that means passing the pulp through machines which serve as mixers only, and

Frank B. Wicks.

from which no separation is made. We find the best results are obtained if we shut those down and did not add the oil until the material was about ready to go into the plant. We have also found out that in some of the machines a lower air pressure was better, that is a lesser quantity of compressed air was required to produce the desired results when we were using the larger quantities of oil.

Q. 103. That was in an apparatus of what type?

A. The Janney mechanical air type.

Q. 104. I am referring both to the operations upon the Vanner concentrates and the slime Vanner tailings. I would like to have you describe the apparatus, without going into great detail?

A. It will probably be necessary to take each plant separately, because they are differently arranged. In the treatment of the Vanner concentrates we employ what is ordinarily known as the single Spitzkasten, Janney mechanical machine.

Q. 105. What mechanical machine does—by mechanical machine what are you attempting to distinguish it from?

A. I am attempting to distinguish from what is ordinarily called the air machine, or the mechanical air machine as the case may be.

Q. 106. In this Janney mechanical machine, state briefly what the machine is?

A. It consists of an agitating cell provided with baffles around the cell, in which revolves a pair of

Frank B. Wicks.

impellers, mounted on a shaft, which in turn is operated by a vertical motor which sets over the top of the cell, and then alongside of this agitating cell or chamber is the box or Spitzkasten in which the separation is made.

Q. 107. I think I will interrupt you, I would like to ask you to make a sketch as you go along so that the court may get a clearer idea of what that apparatus is?

A. (Witness drawing sketch.)

Q. 108. Now, I think you had better describe that and put letters on it as you go along, and that will give a somewhat better illustration?

A. You want me to hold this in my hand?

Q. 109. I think you can do it that way better, and put letters on there as you go along, and state how the pulp moves?

A. Now, following the manner in which the pulp enters the machine, I might indicate it this way: The feed to the machine enters here at A. The feed passes on into the agitating chamber, which is B, and then these agitators here throw the pulp out against these little baffles which I might mark as C on both sides here, and the agitators I mark as D. In the agitating operation, that causes the material to become mixed with the oil and air and so on, and in the operation it is thrown out into a chamber up here which simply acts as a gathering apparatus. From there it flows into the Spitzkasten in here, which I

Frank B. Wicks.

mark F. Now, in this particular machine there are some circulating pipes which come up through this way, and a portion of the material then goes up through these circulating pipes and back into the agitating cell again, and may go around a number of different times before it finally goes out. I will letter the pipes G. There are a pair of them in some of the machines.

Q. 110. Where is the froth taken off?

A. The froth is taken off at what is called the overflow lip, which I will mark H.

Q. 111. Does it simply flow off of itself, or is it scraped off?

A. Sometimes one way and sometimes the other.

Q. 112. What causes the pulp to pass upward through the pipe G and back into the agitating cell?

A. Well, the water level is ordinarily kept up fairly close to the overflow lip.

Q. 113. What keeps it up there?

A. The control of the water level is accomplished by a tailings pipe, a standpipe which regulates the height of the water, because when the water gets up above a certain height the excess overflows, and this overflow pipe I will letter as I. That pipe is adjustable so as to regulate the conditions of the machine. Now, the water level being up here, it forces some of the material to pass back through there.

Q. 114. The pulp is removed, is it, from the agitating cell by this agitator?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, as the pulp flows in there the agitating plates strike it, and in their operation they take it up and throw it out of the cell.

Q. 115. Then the agitator keeps the agitating cell comparatively empty?

A. Yes. If you look down in there, as you can sometimes through some of the machines through the vent pipe, there you can see it is almost a mist in there; it is thrashed up pretty finely.

Q. 116. It is for that reason that the height of the water in the spitzkasten is sufficient to force the pulp back into the agitating cell?

A. I think so, yes, sir.

Q. 117. What have you represented there at the top?

A. That is the motor, an electric motor.

Q. 118. Now, what kind of cell is that that you have drawn which you call the mechanical cell or mechanical air?

A. It is a mechanical cell of the single spitzkasten type.

Q. 119. A double spitzkasten would be how?

A. It would be simply a representation of this spitzkasten that I have described, and another on the opposite side of the machine.

Q. 120. And it would take the froth from both sides of the machine, instead of from one?

A. Yes.

Q. 121. Can you describe in a general way how

Frank B. Wicks.

the mechanical air machine differs from the mechanical machine you have drawn?

A. The mechanical air machine simply has the addition of an air chamber in the spitzkasten which is furnished with low pressure compressed air; the air is added to this air chamber—the top of the air chamber is covered with cotton twill, of a number of thicknesses according to the conditions, and that breaks the air up into very minute particles, and it assists the machine in accomplishing the flotation results.

Q. 122. Simply a box with one side of it cloth, and air supplied to one side so that the air may go out and assist the flotation?

A. Yes.

Q. 123. And that is in to the Spitzkasten?

A. Yes.

Q. 124. And that is what you call a mechanical air machine?

A. Yes.

Q. 125. And without that air box it is a mechanical machine?

A. Yes.

MR. SCOTT: I offer that sketch in evidence, simply as an illustration of the witness' testimony.

Sketch admitted in evidence and marked
DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 27.

Q. 126. Can you obtain illustrations of these me-

Frank B. Wicks.

chanical cells that will be a little clearer than your sketch?

A. I think so; at least we can produce blueprints of them.

Q. 127. That might suffice. How does the material that you have referred to as the slime vanner tailings compare in fineness with the vanner concentrate?

A. Well, the slime vanner tailings are considerably finer.

Q. 128. About how much finer; I think you stated that ninety per cent of the vanner concentrates would go through a 200 mesh, didn't you?

A. Yes. It is rather difficult to say just how much finer, but anyway we know that in vanner concentration, the coarser material or the coarser particles have a tendency to go over ~~the~~ with the concentrate, and the finer particles have a tendency to go with the vanner tailings.

Q. 129. And these vanner tailings you would term extremely fine material?

A. Yes.

Q. 130. Fine slimes?

A. Yes.

Q. 131. Now, I notice that the lower part of this tabulation, which relates to slime vanner tailings, I find that your reports of the treatments on various dates will vary, and the amounts of the oil will vary. Will you state how the treatment with these various amounts compares as to efficiency?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. As a rule the larger amounts of oil are very satisfactory.

Q. 132. Is that true as to commercial results?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 133. Now will you state for the record a comparison of the results with large and small amounts of oil, which illustrates your statement?

A. Well, of course it is difficult to average up these tests from these solitary days, because they represent so many different conditions; but I might compare these individual days with the average of our results up to date, if that is satisfactory.

Q. 134. That will be satisfactory.

A. Now, taking March 14th for example, so as not to string it out too long—March 14th we used 22.80 pounds of oil per ton, and on that date the average tailings loss was .48 per cent copper, and that result was obtained from an average ore or material containing .80 per cent copper.

Q. 135. How much tonnage was treated?

A. We treated 122 tons. The reason for the small tonnage was that we only had a small quantity of oil. That compares directly with the average results of our operations up to date, in which we were treating material averaging .804 per cent copper, and the average tailings loss of our operation up to date was .543 per cent copper as compared with .48 copper for this particular run that I was describing. The per cent of the recovery of our operations up to date for

Frank B. Wicks.

this particular material was 33.139 against this date of March 14th of 41.00; so that for that particular combination of oils, the results were considerably better than the average of our operations up to date.

Q. 136. I notice upon this table with reference to the slime vanner tailings that the indicated recovery varies from—I see 24 per cent here—up to I think the highest is about 37 per cent?

A. 40.49 I think.

Q. 137. 41 there in one instance?

A. Yes.

Q. 138. Will you explain why the recovery is of that order of figures?

A. Well, because of the character of the material treated.

Q. 139. Explain that, please?

A. All of our ores contain—practically all of our ores contain considerable quantities of the oxides of copper and carbonate copper, and in this particular flotation operation it has not been profitable to recover them.

Q. 140. Does the ordinary flotation operation recover these oxides and carbonates, or what mineral does it recover?

A. The ordinary operations recover only the sulphides?

Q. 141. And has that been the case with the operations tabulated upon this sheet of slime vanner tailings?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes. While we probably made some recovery of the oxidized material, it probably was very small.

Q. 142. I notice that this report upon the treatment of slime vanner tailings is signed O. Wiser. Who is Mr. Wiser?

A. Mr. Wiser is the metallurgical engineer of the plant.

Q. 143. And how does it happen that Mr. Wiser's signature appears upon this slime vanner tailings sheet, while the treatment of the vanner concentrates sheet was signed by you?

A. It happened that this report was closed up one afternoon when I was down in the plant, and we were anxious to get it out, so Mr. Wiser signed it. It has no particular significance.

Q. 144. You have the same knowledge as to the accuracy of this report of the slime vanner tailings as upon the other reports you testified about?

A. Yes. I noticed that there are a few days there prior to May 1st, 1915, that, of course, I have not direct knowledge of, but subsequent to that—

Q. 145. Do you know who was in charge at that time?

A. Mr. Wiser was directly in charge of the operations at that time.

Q. 146. During those two days?

A. During that period in April there from the 16th to the 30th.

MR. SCOTT: I offer this tabulation in evidence,

Frank B. Wicks.

and will state that I will have the first entry verified by Mr. Wiser later.

Sheet of tabulations, reports on slime vanner tailings, admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT No. 28.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until 2:00 P. M. of this day, Wednesday, April 18, 1917.

Wednesday, April 18, 1917, 2:00 P. M.

Trial resumed pursuant to adjournment, all parties present; whereupon the following proceedings were had:

Q. 147. MR. SCOTT: Mr. Wicks, you stated this morning something in regard to the over-abundant frothing with large amounts of some kinds of oil; with such oils, as I remember, you reduced the emulsification, the preliminary agitation, and reduced the supply of air in those cells that air was supplied to. What was the reason for diminishing the emulsification and the air supply?

A. Well, simply to cut down the over-abundance of froth.

Q. 148. And what is the effect of that over-abundance of froth; in what way is it objectionable?

A. The greater the volume of froth, generally, the greater amount of gangue becomes entrapped in that froth and is carried over.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 149. Simply on account of the great depth of froth?

A. Of the great depth of froth, yes.

Q. 150. In your plant is there any of the material that first goes off from the spitz boxes returned to the head of the machine?

A. Yes, a portion of it is.

Q. 151. Now, in a general way won't you explain the relation of these machines one to another; for instance you made a sketch of a single one this morning. Tell us how they are arranged in the plant?

A. Well, the machines are ordinarily divided in the plant, or named under three different names or classes. The first machines, or the machines to which the feed passes first, are called emulsifiers, and they serve the purpose of simply agitating the ore pulp with the oil and air and so on, and no separation of the mineral from the gangue is attempted in the emulsifiers.

Q. 152. Are there any spitz boxes connected with these first agitators that you call emulsifiers?

A. No, sir.

Q. 153. They are simply agitators?

A. Simply agitators.

Q. 154. Then, where is the pulp taken?

A. Then the pulp is taken into machines that are called roughers, by virtue of the fact that they produce a rough concentrate, or a low grade concentrate, and after being passed through the roughers—it might pass through one or four or a large number, according to the material treated—

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 155. Those are provided with spitz boxes?

A. With spitz boxes, yes; some are single Spitzkasten and some are double, according to the character of the material. After the feed has passed through the roughers, the reject or gangue constitutes the finished tailing of the flotation operation. The froth or concentrate is called the rough concentrate, and that constitutes the feed to the third group of machines, which are called the cleaners.

Q. 156. That is an entirely separate apparatus?

A. An entirely separate apparatus, but of the same character somewhat; they differ a little according to the kind of work they have to do. The cleaners receive the rough concentrates, and they make a separation in somewhat the same manner, and the froth from the cleaners constitutes the finished concentrate of the flotation operation. The tailing or reject from the cleaners is generally, if not always, returned to the roughers, mixed with the initial feed, that is, it goes back and joins the original feed again, and passes through the roughers, sometimes going through the emulsifiers, and sometimes not, according to the characteristics of the plant, and so on, but anyway it joins the other stuff before the initial feed has been separated in any way.

Q. 157. Why is it that these cleaner tailings are returned to the head of the machine or to one of the roughers?

A. They generally contain a considerable more mineral contents than the average of the tailings loss

Frank B. Wicks.

from the roughing plant, consequently there is material enough in them to make them worth retreating.

Q. 158. They are too valuable to throw away?

A. Yes, sir, and we get other benefits too.

Q. 159. Are these returned cleaner tailings what you refer to as the circulating load?

A. That constitutes what we call the circulating load. The circulating load is the water and material and so on—oil and everything mixed—that is called the circulating load.

Q. 160. Is there any other circulating load in your plant, other than the returned cleaner tailings?

A. Sometimes we take the froth from the last machine in the cleaning apparatus and return that as a circulating load through the cleaner, but that is not always done. What we ordinarily term the circulating load is the cleaner tailings going back to the roughers.

Q. 161. Does this circulating load carry considerable quantity of oil, that is, compared to the solids in them and the water, all mixed with it; is there a considerable quantity of that?

A. We have found that it does.

Q. 162. Do you know how much oil in proportion to the solids, in a general way?

A. I can't say exactly the proportion of oil with reference to the proportion of solids, because our determinations have been made in a somewhat different

Frank B. Wicks.

manner. We have usually determined the circulating load in proportion or percentage of the quantity of initial oil added, and our figures are kept in that way.

Q. 163. Have you any idea as to what proportion the oil in the circulating load bears to the initial oil?

A. Our determination vary very extensively, not absolutely reliable, but they have given us the impression—and I think it is fairly close—that about one-third of the initial oil in circulation. By that I mean that if you are using, for example, 25 pounds of oil—or say, 24 pounds to make it even figures—if you were using 24 pounds of initial oil, approximately one-third of that comes back as the proportion which constitutes the circulating load, and again passes through the roughing plant.

Q. 164. This adds to the amount of oil shown by the figures that you have submitted?

A. We have found that it has the effect of adding the quantity of oil, yes.

Q. 165. Now, in operating with these large quantities of oil which you have testified to in the mill, did you perform any operations of that kind in the laboratory, or have them performed, with large quantities—I mean at your plant at Hurley?

A. Yes, for a long time in our plant we kept a force of men on that kind of work and performed a great number of experiments on the various products,

Frank B. Wicks.

not only the material that is now being treated, but other products also.

Q. 166. And what was the result of your investigations in the laboratory with quantities of oil upwards of 20 pounds per ton?

A. The laboratory results were not very encouraging.

Q. 167. In what way were they not encouraging?

A. We did not succeed in getting satisfactory metallurgical recovery in the laboratory with the big quantities of oil unless we used quantities considerably in excess of commercial possibility.

Q. 168. Haven't you made some figures as to why they were unsatisfactory and what amounts were unsatisfactory in the laboratory, metallurgically, barring out the cost?

A. Well, I have in mind a test conducted with the crude oil and the Jones oil, particularly the Jones oil to which I referred this morning. These were applied to the treatment of the vanner concentrate and in the laboratory it was necessary to use quantities up to 50 and 60 pounds in order to produce results.

Q. 169. When you say "results" do you mean results comparable with those ordinarily obtained in the mill?

A. Well, by that we meant in our work, results that looked encouraging commercially, from a commercial standpoint.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 170. And what happened when you used, say 21 pounds?

A. We didn't get very satisfactory results.

Q. 171. Did you try less than 20 pounds, too?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. 172. And what happened with less than 20 pounds of these oils you mention?

A. Well, we were able to get very fair results with less than 20 pounds, but of course we found it necessary to use the Barrett oil and other more active oils, perhaps, in order to get the results.

Q. 173. With under 20 pounds?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 174. But under 20 pounds, with simply these two oils you mentioned—what were they?

A. I mentioned the California crude oil and the Jones oil.

Q. 175. Yes. Now, with under 20 pounds of California crude and the Jones, without the assistance of the Barrett or anything else, what kind of a result did you get?

A. Only fair.

Q. 176. And then just what do you mean by "only fair?"

A. Well, we either got a very poor recovery or we got a very poor tailing.

Q. 177. And were the results acceptable commercially, in either event?

A. No, not with the Jones and California oils used in small quantities, in the laboratory, they were not.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 178. But with 50 or 60 pounds of this Jones crude and the other oil, you were able to get a fair result, you say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 179. A commercial result, was it?

A. Not commercial, because of the big quantity of oil.

Q. 180. Simply on account of the cost of the oil?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 181. I understand. Now, how did the results in the laboratory that you have just described with this California oil and the Jones oil, compare with the results in the mill?

A. Well, we are finding that we are—Well, we are getting actual commercial results with these same oils or with the Jones oil, in our vanner concentrates plant, with quantities varying from 20 up to 30 pounds. It varies a good deal from day to day.

Q. 182. And is that what you said you could not do in the laboratory, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 183. To what do you attribute this difference between the efficiency of these oils in the laboratory and the mill? Have you any explanation?

A. Well, I think it is due mostly to the benefits of the oil in circulation; that is, we get the oil back from the cleaner tails and that oil serves some benefit in assisting in the oiling of the pulp in the initial feed.

Q. 184. When you referred to getting results with

Frank B. Wicks.

20 or 30 pounds of Jones oil, you meant 20 or 30 pounds of initial oil?

A. Yes, sir, initial oil.

Q. 185. And when you refer to circulating oil, you refer to this oil, and in placing the amount of oil in the machine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 186. That did not take place in your laboratory operations, of course?

A. We didn't get the same results in the laboratory.

Q. 187. Are your laboratory operations of continuous character or simply intermittent in service?

A. These were intermittent in service.

Q. 188. Is there any difficulty in maintaining the necessary oil supply, or obtaining it for operations with large quantities of oil, or can it readily be purchased?

A. We have had no trouble in getting sufficient quantities of oil for our vanner concentrate plant, in which we are using the Barrett oil and the Jones oil; but we have had a great deal of difficulty in getting sufficient quantities of oil for the roughing plant operations, or as we referred to them this morning as the plant in which the slime vanner tailings are treated.

Q. 189. What the nature of that difficulty?

A. Largely a shortage of tank cars and then a shortage of storage capacity at our plant because we could not determine just exactly which of the half dozen different oils were going to be really the very best for our operations and we did not want to lay in a big

Frank B. Wicks.

stock of all of the kinds; so we had to gather up oil from different places and we had a great deal of difficulty in some instances in getting the tank cars and in getting the oil delivered, so it has taken quite a little time to get the matter under way.

Q. 190. Now, in these figures which we discussed this morning and which appear upon the two tabulating statements which you used, the oil is given in a column here, "initial oil".

A. Yes, sir, on both tabulations.

Q. 191. "Pounds per ton on both tabulations, which are exhibits 26 and 28, I think. Do the figures given in these columns represent the new oil added for each ton of new feed that goes into the machine, without reference to this circulating oil?"

A. Yes, sir, that represents a computation between the total weight of the dry material treated and the total weight of the oil that we actually consumed or actually took out of the tank.

Q. 192. Upon this table giving the details of the treatment of the slime vanner tailings I notice near the lower right hand corner, two figures, two numbers under a heading at the top of the page "Oil in circulation, load, pounds per ton." What do these figures represent and how were they obtained?

A. They represent samples taken of the circulating load during that particular day, and if my memory serves me correctly the samples were taken every two hours during the 24, and then that material was analyzed for oil and we found that the quantity of oil con-

Frank B. Wicks.

tained in the circulating load was equivalent to 3.2 pounds per ton of total feed to the machine.

Q. 193. On April 4th, that is?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 194. Then in the next column which is headed "Total oil, pounds per ton", I note the 11.3, which seems to be the sum of the circulating load and the initial oil.

A. Yes, that is the sum.

Q. 195. That for the periods represented in this table which I have not mentioned, nothing appears in the column or in the circulating load, pounds per ton. I take it that no determinations were made, except on these two days when the figures appear?

A. No, sir. We made a determination on January 7th, but we were not satisfied that our method was correct, so we entered it as an approximate quantity. The other days no determination was made.

Q. 196. Was there a circulating load present on these other days when no figures appear?

A. Yes, at all times there was.

Q. 197. Referring again to this statement of the treatment of slime vanner tailings, I will ask you whether the material treated as reported upon this table was selected material, or was it material taken indiscriminately from the supply?

A. Well, you can make no selection in our plant of material; we have to treat what they send us.

Q. 198. This was representative of the slime vanner tailings, was it?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, I believe it was a very fair representation about an average of all the material.

Q. 199. Was there any attempt made to do otherwise than take the material just as it came?

A. No, sir, we took it out in the regular way.

Q. 200. How do these froths compare in appearance, those that are made with larger or smaller quantities of oil, above and below one per cent, say?

A. Well, it depends on the oil used.

Q. 201. Well, you might give us some instance of the particular oils?

A. We have found that the Taft oil which I referred to this morning, and that the sulphur oil to which I referred which was used on April 2nd—we found that the froth of those oils is almost identical with the froth obtained with the use of less than a pound of Barrett's creosote, when the Barrett's creosote is used alone; in fact I doubt very much if anyone going into the plant could distinguish between the two oils, except possibly by the odor.

Q. 202. But some oils you said, I believe, do show a difference in appearance when used in small quantities?

A. Yes; we found that the Jones Fuel oil, which we have found particularly good on the treatment of slime vanner concentrates, is not in any way satisfactory in the treatment of slime vanner tailings, because it produces such a voluminous froth, while it produces a recovery, that it presents more difficulty in treating it in the cleaners.

Frank B. Wicks.

Q. 203. Then that is its difficulty, when the froth is too voluminous? The difficulty in handling it?

A. Yes. The froth gets entirely out of bounds. It runs out over the launders, and the feed pipes are not big enough and the circulating pipes can't handle it, and we can't handle it in our settling tanks or any place else.

MR. SCOTT: That is all.

MR. GARRISON: We now move to strike out the testimony of this witness, the basis of our motion being the statement of counsel for the defendant on page 240 of the transcript of the minutes, where Mr. Scott in his statement to the court as to what he purposed, proving by this witness said: "The testimony which this witness was about to give would have shown that in practical operations the processes of the prior art are practical and are profitable."

On page 243 of the minutes, your honor said, speaking to Mr. Scott:

"The argument this morning seems to be that you cannot introduce testimony of what you can do now without its relation to the prior art."

"MR. SCOTT: The evidence that I propose to introduce now is a duplication of the prior art, merely showing its practical application on a practical scale. (Then a sentence which I will not read)."

"THE COURT: This witness whom you have on the stand, and by virtue of the question that you had proposed, and others, we will say, like it, are you proposing to show the prior art and what may be accomplished by it?"

Frank B. Wicks.

And the answer was: "Absolutely." Now, we say he has absolutely refrained from showing anything as to the prior art, and under the circumstances his testimony should be stricken out.

MR. SCOTT: I do not propose to examine this witness as to the literature of the prior art. The patent specifications are in existence. I propose to examine this witness on the facts, which will enable an expert to pass his opinion on whether those prior art principles are practicable, and the expert witness cannot do that until I have the facts for him to pass upon.

THE COURT: What principle of the prior art do you apply this to; you have not shown what particular process this is.

MR. SCOTT: Well, I will take one instance of the prior art. The California Journal of Technology, for instance—

MR. GARRISON: It is not in evidence.

MR. SCOTT: I cannot present the whole case at once. One witness at a time is all we can have. The California Journal of Technology about a year and a half or two years before the patent in suit—in that we have a discussion of what is called the Elmore Bulk Oil Process. These writers go on to describe what they have discovered, as follows: They state that if the ore be powdered and mixed with water and oil, and in proportion varying in their different operations, from two per cent to seven or eight per cent—they have a series of experiments—then the mixture is violently agitated, the agitation will have the effect of beating up the mix-

Frank B. Wicks.

ture so that a foam or froth arises, carrying the mineral. They go on to discuss the permanency of this froth, its effectiveness in concentrating the ore, and in other ways describing the properties of the operations that are carried out today, in a clearer and more concise and more perfect terms than appears in this patent in suit. Now, there is not the slightest deviation between what this witness testified to and what is set forth in that journal. The journal states that the mixture of ore, water and oil as the witness has described it. The journal describes the agitation as the witness has described it, and after that agitation the formation of a froth—after the ceasing of the agitation the formation of the froth with its abundance of air bubbles, the air bubbles carrying the mineral, the same as he describes it. The publication describes the permanency of this froth and its general characteristics as described by the witness. In every respect it conforms. Now, if we were able to present two witnesses simultaneously, I could have met Judge Garrison's objection; otherwise it is impossible. There are the facts, and there is the publication in evidence; and as soon as the orderly presentation of the case permits, what the witness has testified to will be connected with the disclosure contained in this publication. I don't know that this witness ever saw the publication; he may, or he may not.

MR. GARRISON: From what I just read of the proceedings, it is quite obvious that my purpose was perfectly clear, to elicit from counsel for the defendant whether he purposed to give this testimony in this way,

Frank B. Wicks.

which he now says he intended, or whether he purposed by this witness demonstrating the state of the art and the practical operation of the same before, and, he, in answer to your honor's question, said that he absolutely intended to do the latter. Now, he absolutely has not done the latter, and we are left in the very situation which I feared. We have not as yet any evidence as to the prior art, which he says they are going to connect this with; we have not yet any evidence in the exposition of that by an expert which he says he is going to produce, to give us a clear understanding of it; so that your honor will observe that it is absolutely impossible for us to cross examine this witness intelligently now because every question that we would ask him would have to be referred to an expert for him to answer. We cannot ascertain from this witness whether or not this illustrates the prior art, because this witness has not been qualified to testify to the prior art, nor has anybody else. So, if your honor is not going to strike the testimony, then we most respectfully request that our cross examination may be postponed until after the expert witnesses have testified in respect to the prior art, to connect it with this testimony.

MR. SCOTT: Counsel is at liberty as fully now as he ever will be to cross examine this witness about what he has testified to. It is not competent to cross examine this witness about prior art, because he has not testified about prior art; he has testified about certain operations. When our expert witness testifies and illustrates the prior art, then counsel can cross

Frank B. Wicks.

examine the expert about the prior art. There is no use postponing this cross examination so that the witness can be cross examined about something that he did not testify to. He has testified to facts, and he can be cross examined now as well as any other time, and I see no reason for disturbing the orderly conduct of the case for the simple reason that counsel cannot now cross examine the witness on something that he has not testified about, and that is what the entire objection amounts to.

THE COURT: This witness has testified merely to facts which he claims he knows of his own knowledge and from his own operation or the operation of the plant with which he is connected, and has not assumed, himself, to know anything about the prior art; he has told us nothing about it. The statement of the defense is that they will eventually show that what has been done by this witness, as described by him, is a part of the prior art. I think the order in which we are proceeding is satisfactory. As to the cross examination, I cannot see any reason why you cannot cross examine him fully, because he has only testified to his own acts. You may proceed, and if later you want to question him further, you will be given the opportunity. At this time the motion to strike will be denied. Of course, if it appears later on that it has no relation to the prior art, the motion to strike out may be renewed. You may proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS: Before proceeding with the cross examination of this witness, I would like to re-

Frank B. Wicks.

quest of counsel for the defendant that we be supplied with specimens of the material of which this witness has testified, the vanner concentrates, the vanner tailings, and the various oils used, which have simply been denominated by their commercial names. May we have those?

MR. SCOTT: These operations extended over two and a half years, but as far as possible we will supply you with anything, and furthermore we should be very glad to have you visit the plant, if you have any objection to this testimony, as you have signified, on account of not having been present during the two and a half years that the witness testified to. We make the offer today that you may visit the plant now, and as far as possible we will supply you with the material asked for.

MR. WILLIAMS: How many days would it take to go to the plant and spend a couple of days there, and delay the trial?

MR. SCOTT: It was absolutely impossible to have you there during the last two and a half years.

MR. WILLIAMS: How soon will you give us the samples?

MR. SCOTT: As soon as possible.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think it will be impossible to finish cross-examining until we have had an opportunity to examine the characteristics of this material about which the witness has testified.

THE COURT: Proceed with the cross examination.

Frank B. Wicks.

CROSS EXAMINATION.
BY MR. WILLIAMS:

X-Q. 204. Mr. Wicks, you say you have been associated with mill and metallurgical companies for about twelve years?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 205. And that carries you back exactly to what time?

A. To the fall of 1905, I think, or 1906—I will have to figure it back, because I remember the number of years connection with each plant—I think it was in the fall of 1906 when I first became connected with metallurgical operations.

X-Q. 206. And at what plant?

A. I was first employed at what is now the Midvale plant of the United States Smelting & Refining Company.

X-Q. 207. And what was your position there?

A. During the first part of the time I was doing clerical work under the direction of the master mechanic; and then, before the plant closed down, which it did in 1907, I was made assistant master mechanic.

X-Q. 208. And your work was in the mill?

A. No, only part in the mill there; we had a small mill there, and my work was scattered throughout the plant, which was a mill and smelter and all that goes with it.

X-Q. 209. You had nothing to do with flotation at that time?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. No, sir, nothing at all.

X-Q. 210. Then you say that during the next five years your duties were both mechanical and metallurgical. Was that in the same plant?

A. No, sir, I was with the Utah Copper Company at the Garfield plant.

X-Q. 211. What was your position during that time?

A. I had the title of plant engineer during most of the time that I was there, in fact I did during all the time except the first two or three months, while they were trying me out.

X-Q. 212. That would run from 1908 to 1913?

A. I went there in April in 1908, and my connection with the Utah Copper Company ceased in November, 1912.

X-Q. 213. Any experience with flotation there?

A. Experimentally, only.

X-Q. 214. During what part of the term of your employment?

A. I can't recall just when it was that we first began to give consideration to flotation. I know I had been there a number of years—or at least I had been there some time when flotation was first discussed as far as I know. Of course my position was pretty ^{much} subordinate there, and there were lots of things going on around the plant of which I did not know anything. But it was sometime after I had been there, I know, that flotation was first discussed.

X-Q. 215. Then you said that in the next three years you had supervision over mill operations. Where was that?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. At Butte; at the Butte and Superior Copper Company, now—

X-Q. 216. (Interrupting) "now Mining Company." And now, what was the period of that experience?

A. I came to Butte in October, 1912, but I did not become associated with the company until December of 1912.

X-Q. 217. And then you continued with them?

A. I continued with them until April of 1915.

X-Q. 218. You had supervision over their mill?

A. I was mill superintendent.

X-Q. 219. Mill superintendent of the Butte & Superior Company for a period of three years?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 220. I presume you had quite some experience with flotation?

A. Considerable.

X-Q. 221. When you came to work there, the flotation plant was installed?

A. It was operating intermittently.

X-Q. 222. At Butte?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 223. And when you left the Butte and Superior Company where did you go?

A. Went to the Chino Copper Company.

X-Q. 224. And your position there?

A. Is, as I have said, the assistant superintendent of mills.

X-Q. 225. What education had you had in metallurgy and mining and milling?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. My education extends only through the high school course, so far as actual schooling is concerned.

X-Q. 226. Not in any technical school?

A. No, none at all, sir.

X-Q. 227. So that your technical knowledge has been acquired by experience?

A. And continuous study.

X-Q. 228. You are familiar with the operations of the

P. 2467, After L. 10, insert "A. I had supervision over them, yes sir."

and studying the operations?

A. Yes, sir, to a considerable extent.

X-Q. 230. About what proportions of oil were used in the Butte plant when you were in charge of the milling?

A. Well, we used a number of different proportions. I can't recall the figures off hand, because it was so long since severing my connection with the company, but we used various quantities.

X-Q. 231. You used six pounds to the ton at times, did you not?

A. We went considerably higher than that, if my recollection is right.

X-Q. 232. And your results were not very satisfactory when you went so high?

A. Well, that is rather difficult to answer.

X-Q. 233. When did you first acquire a knowledge of flotation concentration of ores?

A. I began to study it along in the early part of

Frank B. Wicks.

1912—and while I had had a general knowledge of it before, I hadn't had any especial knowledge, but I began to give it a considerable study in 1912.

X-Q. 234. That was just prior to your employment by the Butte & Superior Company?

A. Yes, sir; I rather anticipated that I would have use for that information, and, while I had read a good deal on it prior to that time, kept up with the general progress of events, as all intelligent men do, I did not give it any special study until along in 1912.

X-Q. 235. Well, first, when did you give it any study?

A. I can't remember.

X-Q. 236. During the early years, say the first two years of your experience in connection with mining and milling, what did you know or learn about flotation?

A. That is too far back, I can't remember that.

X-Q. 237. I show you plaintiff's exhibit 9, what appears to be a copy of a letter signed by you and addressed to Mr. F. G. Janney, manager of mills, Utah Copper Company. Do you recognize that as a copy of a letter written by you, or as the original letter, whichever it may be?

A. Yes, sir, I recognize my signature; I can identify this letter.

X-Q. 238. How did you come to address it to Mr. F. G. Janney, manager, of mills, Utah Copper Company, when it appears to relate to the affairs of the Butte & Superior Company?

A. I don't know what Mr. Janney's connection was

Frank B. Wicks.

with the Butte & Superior Company, or whether he had any actual connection, but I know that it was upon Mr. Janney's recommendation that I was transferred to Butte, and he guided me through the first months of my work here, and I frequently consulted with him.

X-Q. 239. Well, isn't this a report about the affairs of the Butte & Superior Company?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 240. The letter is a description of Mr. Hyde's connection with the Butte & Superior flotation operation, is it not?

A. So far as the operations go, yes, it is.

X-Q. 241. How did you come to make this report?

A. He requested me to do so.

X-Q. 242. I read from this letter of yours: "Green has been running a number of tests on the flotation feed to determine the benefit derived by allowing the pulp to stand for a period of time in contact with a weak solution of acid before treatment. He finds that whenever he allows the flotation pulp to stand for an hour or more, with the addition of two pounds of acid per ton of solids that he gets a good tailing and a good concentrate, in the laboratory machine, regardless of the percentage of slimes and using from four to six pounds of oil per ton of ore. His tests have been so successful that we are now preparing to handle the mill pulp in this manner." Does that refresh your memory as to the operations in the mill using from four to six pounds of oil to the ton of ore?

A. My recollection is that at that time represented

Frank B. Wicks.

a decrease in the quantity of oil rather than being representative of what we had actually been using.

X-Q. 243. But this letter says: "We are now preparing to handle the mill pulp in this manner. Did you do so?"

A. I don't remember whether we did or not. I know that we tried out that scheme of adding acid sufficiently far ahead of the flotation operation and, if my memory serves me correctly, that worked out very nicely, but as to the amount of oil, I do not know.

X-Q. 244. Well, how much do you think it was, about?

A. I wouldn't venture to estimate because I haven't the figures, and a good many things have taken place since then.

X-Q. 245. Hadn't Mr. Janney come to the Butte mill to help out in the operation before this letter was written to him, Mr. F. G. Janney?

A. I think so.

X-Q. 246. But you don't know that he then had any actual connection with the Butte & Superior Company?

A. I don't know just what his connection was, but I know that he more or less directed my work during the first month of my operations at Butte.

X-Q. 247. And this was on September 16, 1913, after you had been there some time?

A. Yes, sir, I had been there several months, yes, sir.

X-Q. 248. Now, can you say that at any time up to we will say September 16, 1913, in the Butte and Superior mill, you used, in commercial operations, about

Frank B. Wicks.

four pounds of oil or six pounds of oil to the ton of ore?

A. I don't see that I would be expected to remember these figures because that is a long ways back. I have no doubt but what the records that I kept at that time will show.

X-Q. 249. Will you give me your best recollection on that question?

A. At what particular time?

X-Q. 250. Up to September 16, 1913, the date of this letter.

A. That is the average of all of it?

X-Q. 251. No, no, whether at any time during that period you used in commercial operations in the Butte & Superior plant, either four pounds of oil to the ton of ore or six pounds of oil to the ton of ore.

A. I have my doubts about ever having operated at that low a figure.

X-Q. 252. What is your best recollection as to figures that you did operate on, we will say the lowest figure that you did operate on?

A. I would have to refer to the records, Mr. Williams; without them, I couldn't offer an estimate.

X-Q. 253. Will you look up the records and endeavor to answer the question that I have put to you and that your memory does not enable you to answer?

A. Well, I have no connection with the Butte & Superior Company now.

X-Q. 254. Yes, but you are testifying for the Butte & Superior Company, and it may be that they would be

Frank B. Wicks.

kind enough to let you have access to their records of the time when you were superintendent of the mill. Will you endeavor to do so?

A. I will endeavor to do so, but I can't promise to produce them, because I have no connection with the company; no authority to do so.

MR. WILLIAMS: Will counsel endeavor to overcome the difficulty of the witness in getting access to the records of the work done by him?

MR. KREMER: When the witness makes the request we will see.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I make the request of you; please see that the witness is supplied with the information?

MR. KREMER: I can't promise you, because I don't know its availability.

MR. WILLIAMS: If available, you will endeavor to give the witness an opportunity to examine those records? Is that right?

MR. KREMER: If it is available in such form that he can get a complete examination, it will be done; otherwise it will not. *X 254 1/2*

MR. WILLIAMS: [^] You testified about certain operations on November 18th, 19th and 20th of 1916, when the amount of oil used was 23.70 pounds to a ton of ore. Is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 255. You did not describe the oils that were used on that occasion. Will you please do so?

A. We used a combination of Barrett's No. 4 creosote oil and Jones' flotation oil.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 256. In what proportion?

A. I can't say the proportion. Our records do not show. These proportions are varied from time to time because they are added separately and they are added at the discretion of the operator.

X-Q. 257. How are you able to testify as to the oils that were used at that time?

A. The quantities are measured directly and the quantities missing or disappearing from the tanks are checked against the reports of the various foremen, and the various foremen make the measurements themselves in this particular case.

X-Q. 258. What is your record of the particular oils that were used there?

A. Barrett's No. 4 and Jones' oil.

X-Q. 259. What is your record of that? I don't see it in the slip that you have handed me.

A. We have not shown that in that slip; it wasn't considered essential there.

X-Q. 260. Have you a record of it?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 261. On another document?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 262. What is this other document which contains this record that does not appear on the one put in evidence?

A. This is an entry of the results obtained each day during the month of November, in this particular plant. That shows there simply just the summarized results.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am going to request counsel

Frank B. Wicks.

to give ^{us} access to this detailed statement which gives particulars that do not appear on the one put in evidence.

MR. SCOTT: I think it is sufficient if the witness testified from these records. He has a great, voluminous record, which obviously can not be used to encumber this case. He will answer fully as to any information contained in that.

THE COURT: Counsel has a right to examine that if he desires.

(Whereupon counsel referred to the record held by the witness.)

MR. WILLIAMS: Q. This memorandum at the foot of the list that you have referred to, does that note "kinds of oil used, B" signify Barrett's No. 4?

A. Barrett's No. 4 creosote.

X-Q. 263. J. Jones'; T turpentine; Ch., Chesapeake pine; is that descriptive of the oil used?

A. That was considered sufficiently descriptive for our purpose because these initials appeared here.

X-Q. 264. Oh, then you had in a separate column the initials there describing such oils as were used at that time?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 256. And they show that you used this combination of B and J on November 4th, and so on continuously until November 28th, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 266. And on November 29th and 30th you do not

Frank B. Wicks.

seem to have any record of the kind of oil used; is that right?

A. I think that is an oversight. I think that was possibly Jones' and Barrett's oil, because there are no other oils called for except those that are called for up here. But I can verify that if necessary.

X-Q. 267. How can you verify them?

A. By referring back to the records made by the various shift foremen, the pencil records that were taken.

X-Q. 268. Well, never mind, then. I note that on November 25th the oil pounds per ton is 26.14. That is correct is it not?

A. Yes, sir; that is correct. I remember having referred back to that to make sure of it.

X-Q. 269. And then on November 21st, the day after, the last three of these, the amount of oil was 17.16?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 270. And then on November 17th, the day before these three, the amount was 15.26?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 271. I note also that at the beginning of the month the amount of oil used was 8.06 pounds per ton. Is that true?

A. Yes, sir, I believe so.

X-Q. 272. How do you account for the increase in the quantity of oil which really becomes manifest a day or two before these three that you have spoken of?

A. Well, partly because of the increase in the mineral content, or copper content of the material treated.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 273. Does that show in the table?

A. Yes, sir; that does not account for all of it, however.

X-Q. 274. That is to say, the concentrates were to some extent a little richer, that were fed to this plant?

A. On the 5th of the month, the copper content of the feed to the plant equalled 3.60% copper, but by the 17th of the month it had increased to 10.23% copper.

X-Q. 275. And then on the 18th it dropped down to 9.02% copper?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 276. And the oil went up from 15.46 to 23.98?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 277. So that does not explain it?

A. Partly, yes. There are so many things that may affect it.

X-Q. 278. Under whose direction was the amount of oil increased for that test, we will say, of November 18th, or that work on November 18th?

A. On November 18th—well, that was done under Mr. Wiser's direction, but was done by the various shift foremen in charge of flotation on the three shifts in the mill. On account of the variable character of the material treated they are allowed a great deal of discretion as to the proportion and kinds of oil that they use.

X-Q. 279. You had not commenced, then, to intentionally increase the amount of oil above 20% to see what you could get—20 pounds to the ton of oil, to see what you could do?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. We were trying to keep it down just as low as we could.

X-Q. 280. At that time?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 281. Was that the first time in these operations that you ran up to above 27⁰ pounds of oil to the ton of ore?

A. I am unable to say, but I think there are probably times when it went above that. I am not certain. Our metallurgists had been calling attention to the gradual increase in the quantities of oil and we had not been able to understand just what the reason was.

X-Q. 282. One of the oils which, according to this table, was used on that day, is marked on the table, "Jones." What is its full commercial use?

A. I don't know; we call it Jones flotation oil, but whether that is the commercial name or not, I do not know.

X-Q. 283. Do you know whether it is known as Jones' fuel oil?

A. I am not certain. We always call it Jones' Flotation Oil.

X-Q. 284. What kind of an oil is it?

A. It is a moderately heavy petroleum oil; it comes from some place in Kansas.

X-Q. 285. Is it or is it not very nearly in its natural condition?

A. I don't know whether it has been put through a refining process or not, but I believe that it has.

X-Q. 286. Is it a viscous oil or a thin oil?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Somewhat viscous.

X-Q. 287. What is your general recollection as to the proportions of Barrett's and Jones' oil that were used about the time of these operations, to wit, during the month of November?

A. Well, they varied a great deal from day to day. I know that the Barrett's oil generally constituted the major portion of the oil, but not always.

X-Q. 288. Barrett's oil is a creosote?

A. Yes, sir; we have been calling it creosote; I think it is.

X-Q. 289. What kind of an oil is it?

A. I believe it is a coal tar product.

X-Q. 290. And where does that come from?

A. We buy it from the Barrett Company, and they ship it, part of it, from Chicago—I don't remember where they shipped the rest of it from, but I don't know where it is produced.

X-Q. 201. It is the Barrett Company of Chicago?

A. It is the roofing company that goes by the name of "Barrett Company."

X-Q. 292. And that is a sort of a thick, tarry material, is it?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 293. How would you describe it?

A. It is a fairly thin oil.

X-Q. 294. And who do you purchase the Jones oil from?

A. George B. Jones & Company, I believe.

X-Q. 295. Of?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I don't know their address.

X-Q. 296. Am I right in understanding that you have no record which will enable you to say what the relative proportions of Barrett and Jones oil ~~there~~ were in the operations of November 18th, 19th and 20th, 1916?

A. I have no record here.

X-Q. 297. Is there a record?

A. I think there is. The scratch records should show that. I haven't any doubt but that they will.

X-Q. 298. Will you look up that record and arrange to have it sent here?

A. If you wish me to.

X-Q. 299. And please be prepared to refer to the records for the purpose of completing those operations that you have testified to.

X-Q. 300. On November 18th, 19th and 20th, of 1916, what in general were your mill operations? You have described them only in relation to the flotation plant. What was done with the ore up to the point that it entered the flotation plant?

A. I don't recall that there was anything special on those days.

X-Q. 301. Well, what does the mill do with the ore before it reaches the flotation plant; describe it generally?

A. Well, we crush it and grind it and concentrate it on tables and regrind it in the usual manner, and then we treat it on vanners, either sand vanners or slime vanners or tables, according to the size and character.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 302. But how finely do you grind the feed to the vanners?

A. I presume that there is very little feed—I haven't the record here, but judging from this book I presume that there is very little feed treated by the vanners that is coarser than twenty mesh.

X-Q. 303. And the greater part of it is finer?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 304. But you cannot give a screen analysis of the feed to the vanner?

A. I can produce them, but I haven't them in Butte with me.

X-Q. 305. I think I would like you to let us have those?

A. You will understand of course that conditions vary from time to time.

X-Q. 306. Well, how do the conditions since January 1st, 1917, compare with those existing in November, 1916?

A. There is no important change in that time.

X-Q. 307. The changes that you speak of are merely adaptations from time to time to variations in the ore?

A. Partly, and partly to gradually increasing tonnage, or increasing capacity and efficiency and so on.

X-Q. 308. You did not make any change in your grinding operations when you changed from less than twenty pounds of oil to more than twenty pounds of oil?

A. No, we made no difference in the grinding operations at all.

X-Q. 309. Did you make any other change in the

Frank B. Wicks.

treatment of the ore before it reached the flotation plant as a result of the change in the quantity of oil, or in connection with it?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 310. So that the feed to the flotation plants would be on an average substantially the same with the more than the twenty pounds of oil as it was with less than twenty pounds of oil?

A. Yes. When we had these oils available, we simply put them in, and cut down the quantity of the other oil, without changing the method in any way, except that when we had to cut out certain portions of the plant in order to cut down the tonnage, so that we would have oil enough so that we could make a reasonably good run.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

X-Q. 311. Will you give me a description of the ore that is treated in the Chino mill?

A. It is a copper ore, low grade ordinarily.

X-Q. 312. Running in what percentage of copper during the period of your knowledge, or the general average?

A. For what particular period, Mr. Williams?

X-Q. 313. Well, take the period while you were there?

A. I can tell you approximately in a few minutes—well, a little under two per cent.

X-Q. 314. And what percentage of that is sulphide?

A. The proportion of sulphide varies from time to time. I am unable to say just what the average proportion of sulphide is.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 316. Give it the other way; what proportion is oxidized?

A. My answer would be the same, the proportion of oxidized or carbonate material varies from time to time.

X-Q. 316. The oxidized is usually in the form of carbonate?

A. Part of it is.

X-Q. 317. Any silicate?

A. I have seen specimens of silicate in the ore at various times.

X-Q. 318. Is your oxidized ore a dead loss in your flotation operations?

A. Not entirely so.

X-Q. 319. You float some of it?

A. I think we do.

X-Q. 320. You have not any exact determinations?

A. We have not any exact determinations on that, no, sir.

X-Q. 321. What else does your ore contain besides sulphide of copper and oxidized copper?

A. It contains some native copper.

X-Q. 322. Do you recover that by flotation?

A. I think we do a little, but it is exceedingly difficult to make any determination of that, because the material going into the flotation plant is so fine that I know of no satisfactory way of making a metallic copper determination of it.

X-Q. 323. There is not very much metallic copper I suppose?

A. The major portion of the metallic copper comes out in the tabling operations.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 324. What else besides native copper, sulphide of copper and oxidized copper?

A. Some cuprite.

X-Q. 325. And what is cuprite?

A. That is an oxide of copper.

X-Q. 326. What are the gangues?

A. Principally silicious gangues.

X-Q. 327. In what condition do you find that gangue as you treat it in the flotation plant?

A. In what size, you mean?

X-Q. 328. Yes. Is it colloidal?

A. A large part of it is as near as we can determine.

X-Q. 329. How do you account for the fact that so much of the oxidized copper goes with the slimes tailings from the vanner, and so little apparently with the finest concentrates?

A. Largely because of its relatively lighter character; that is, it is more nearly the gravity of the gangue than the sulphide is.

X-Q. 330. Is there any material that you would call clay in ore?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 331. Is the silicious material of a clayey nature?

A. I never thought of it in exactly that way. Some of the gangue is true quartzite and some of it is granite and some of it is porphyry.

X-Q. 332. Have you any record of the exact analysis, complete analysis of your ore?

A. Of the crude ore, no, sir.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 333. Will you let us have a specimen of your crude ore; that is to say, a specimen that has not been wetted, so that an analysis may determine the condition of the crude ore; dry ground?

A. Dry ground to what fineness?

X-Q. 334. Crushed to a quarter of an inch?

A. If the attorneys are willing for me to do so?

MR. KREMER: We have no objection. We will be very glad to have him do it if he can.

X-Q. 335. You have the permission. Will you do so?

A. I will endeavor to do so.

X-Q. 336. In the operation of your flotation plant since December 20th, 1916, what speed of agitation have you used in the Janney flotation machines that you have described?

A. We used the same speed that we were using before we made no change in that.

X-Q. 337. And what is that speed?

A. The flotation machines are driven by alternating current motors which have a synchronous speed of 600 revolutions a minute. I presume they actually operate at around 560 or 565 revolutions per minute.

X-Q. 338. That is, under the conditions of load?

A. Yes, and under the various electrical conditions obtaining in the plant.

X-Q. 339. What is the diameter of these agitators?

A. I don't remember the diameter—let me understand you; do you mean the diameter of the agitator or of the agitator cell?

X-Q. 340. The diameter of the agitating blades?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I think that they are about eight inches and twelve inches but I would not say for certain, because I don't remember.

X-Q. 341. Have you working drawings of these Janney machines?

A. I haven't them here.

X-Q. 342. Can you produce them—as I recollect you were asked and said that you would. Are you able to produce them?

A. If the attorneys are willing I haven't any doubt that they can be produced. I will endeavor to do so with their permission.

MR. WILLIAMS: Will you produce working drawings of the Janney machines used at the Chino plant?

MR. KREMER: We have no objection to their being produced.

MR. SCOTT: I will get the witness to make you a sketch. I don't know what information he has at hand—

MR. WILLIAMS: He cannot give the dimensions without the working drawings.

X-Q. 343. The lower agitator is of less diameter than the upper, is it not?

A. I think so.

X-Q. 344. Because the lower agitator revolves alongside the baffles and the upper agitator revolves above the baffles, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 345. I understand that the blades of the agitator are on a shaft which extends down from the motor?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 346. And that the speed that you have given for the motor is the speed of the agitators, is that right?

A. That was my intention, yes, sir.

X-Q. 347. Now, you have not said anything about temperatures in any of these operations that you have described. At what temperatures have you operated during your experience in this Chino mill?

A. We do not make any record of the temperatures.

X-Q. 348. Do you heat your pulp?

A. Occasionally we have heated the pulp leading to the plant which treats the low grade vanner concentrates, but only to a very limited extent, and as far as I can remember it has been a number of months since that was done.

X-Q. 349. Now, take the operation since December 21st, 1916?

A. I feel fairly confident that there has been no heating done during that period, nor for several months before that.

X-Q. 350. And when you did heat, you applied your heat to the feed to the flotation plant which treated the vanner concentrates, is that right?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 351. And you never applied heat to the feed to the flotation plant which treats the vanner tailings, is that right?

A. Yes. We have never tried that.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 352. How about the thickness of the pulp used during the time that you have been connected with this mill?

A. The thickness of the pulp varies a great deal from time to time. If you wish any specific time I probably could give you that information.

X-Q. 353. Give me November of 1916 first, and then give me some operation since December 20th, 1916?

A. In November, 1916, the average dilution of the pulp, or average per cent of solids, which is the way that we keep it, was 37.03 per cent solids in the pulp.

X-Q. 354. I note now looking at this table that the lowest percentage of solids to pulp occurred on the days November 18th, 19th and 20th. That is true, is it not?

A. No, that is not true. On the 28th there was 29.48 per cent solids in the feed, as compared with the 18th and 19th, a greater quantity of solids in it.

X-Q. 355. And with that single exception the run was much higher for the percentage of solids in pulp?

A. I will call attention to the 25th, when the percentage of solids was 33.2, which was lower than those two days, although higher than the third day.

X-Q. 356. And it was on that day that your oil went up to 26.14 pounds to the ton?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 357. So there seems to be a relation between the percentage of solids in the pulp and the percentage of oil used; that is true, is it not?

A. The matter has not been called to my attention

Frank B. Wicks.

before. There might be some relation there which I have not discovered.

X-Q. 358. Does not it appear so from those tables which you have before you?

A. I would have to compare them pretty extensively before I would be able to say.

X-Q. 359. Well, take the other low figure of the percentage of solids, and you find the pounds of oil was 18.41. That is right, isn't it?

A. Yes. There may be some relationship there.

X-Q. 360. And we find on the first day of the month 8.06 pounds of oil per ton, and percentage of solids 46.43—I think that last figure is 3. Is that right?

A. Probably it is 46.43. It does not matter really. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 361. And for November 18th, we find the percentage of solids 30.53; November 19th 32.10, November 20th, 26.92. That is true, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 362. Could you supply us with a flow sheet of your mill?

A. I have no authority to give out the flow sheet of the mill, Mr. Williams.

X-Q. 363. Could you supply us with a flow sheet of the flotation plant?

A. I have no authority to give out any of the flow sheets.

X-Q. 364. But you have described the flow of the material. Can't you let us have an accurate official drawing, such as every mill has, showing just exactly what those flows are?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I would have to get permission from the general manager, under whose jurisdiction I am.

X-Q. 365. Who is your general manager?

A. Mr. John M. Sully.

X-Q. 366. Did he give you permission to come here and give evidence.

A. He was away from the plant when I left.

X-Q. 367. Will you endeavor to get that permission and produce those flow sheets?

A. I will ask him if he is willing for them to be presented.

MR. WILLIAMS: Counsel gives notice that unless the witness produces the official flow sheet, motion will be made to strike out all of his testimony in relation to the flow of material in the plant, and that covers about the whole of his testimony.

MR. KREMER: We, of course, cannot restrain counsel from making motions to strike, but at this time we state that the witness is upon the stand, and if he is desirous of knowing anything about the flow sheets, he can ask any questions that will call from the witness a response that will describe the flow sheet or the operation of the mill. It is not incumbent on the witness to furnish a picture.

X-Q. 368. Have you got that flow sheet here?

A. I am not certain whether I have or not. I will look—I have one covering a portion of the mill dated January 3rd, 1917.

X-Q. 369. Does that include the flotation part?

A. No, sir, this is the concentrating department.

Frank B. Wicks.

It shows the upper end or the preliminary operation of the flotation plant, merely as a connector, so as to show where the products from the concentrating department go.

X-Q. 370. So that it shows the flow of the material up to the flotation plant, and the commencement of the flotation plant?

A. Yes, it shows the emulsification into the flotation plant.

X-Q. 371. Will you supply, or permit us to make a copy of that flow sheet?

A. I don't feel that I have authority to do so. It is the property of the Chino Mining Company. With permission I should be very glad to do so.

MR. WILLIAMS: I ask the court to order that we have permission to examine that flow sheet.

THE COURT: What is this?

MR. WILLIAMS: The flow sheet of the mill, showing the manner in which the material is fed to the flotation plant.

THE COURT: Yes, you have it here within the jurisdiction of the court. You will furnish it to the counsel. It is material on cross examination.

MR. KREMER: Of course we have no objection to it whatever. We believe that the statement of Mr. Wicks, appearing of record, will sufficiently protect him in the matter.

X-Q. 372. You have stated that the finer concentrates of the vanner go through the flotation plant. Is that correct?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. The finer portion, I said.

X-Q. 373. What becomes of the coarser portion?

A. That is treated on the tables.

X-Q. 374. Does that ever go to the flotation plant?

A. I think not.

X-Q. 375. Does this flow sheet show what becomes of the coarser concentrates from the vanners?

A. I think that the flow sheet simply shows that it goes to the vanner concentrate retreatment plant. That is a plant which has classifiers, tables and so on. It simply makes notes on the bottom of the flow sheet that the material passes to the retreatment plant; that is all.

X-Q. 376. Where do you add the oil to the pulp in your operations, and if there was any difference before December 21st, 1916, and afterwards, you can explain?

A. As far as I know there is no difference at all, except that in some cases more emulsification was necessary than others.

X-Q. 377. Where do you add the oil?

A. Ahead of the emulsifier.

X-Q. 378. Between the emulsifiers and the vanners

A. Well, directly ahead of the emulsifiers, which of course puts in between those.

X-Q. 379. You have not any regrinding between the vanners and the flotation plant there, have you?

A. No, sir, not at this time.

X-Q. 380. Did you at any time?

A. We never have had.

X-Q. 381. Why did you say not at this time?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Because we are preparing to regrind the sand vanner concentrates. That is something we have not discussed yet. We are preparing to regrind them, and if possible treat them by flotation.

X-Q. 382. And to add oil during the regrinding?

A. That has not been worked out yet, Mr. Williams; we have not decided.

X-Q. 383. But you do not do anything of that sort, and have not done anything of that sort during the period of your experience at the mill?

A. You mean adding oil during regrinding?

X-Q. 384. Yes.

A. Well, there is always a little oil present in all the circulating waters all through the plant, but we do not go up above the grinding machines and deliberately add oil for the purpose of adding oil to the pulp; but there is always a little oil present.

X-Q. 385. That is to say you have a circulation of water from the tailings back to some part of the mill?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 386. Just describe that please?

A. Well, the desert conditions in that country make it necessary to conserve the water supply by impounding the tailings and returning the water, and that water which is so circulated represents the major portion of our water supply.

X-Q. 387. In practically all parts of the mill?

A. In all parts except where absolutely clear water is required.

X-Q. 388. Have you ever made any analyses of that

Frank B. Wicks.

water, the circuit water, to determine what was in it by way of contamination?

A. We have endeavored to do so, but we never have taken any long drawn-out samples or for any long period, samples for the purpose of analyses. I think we have made analyses from time to time, but whether they are complete or not, I don't know.

X-Q. 389. What generally do they show as to the condition of that circuit water?

A. They show a certain acidity in sulphuric acid and in copper sulphate in solution, and considerable ferrous or ferric compounds.

X-Q. 390. Phenol and cresol?

A. Sometimes.

X-Q. 391. Is the oily reagent emulsified with this water before passing to flotation?

A. Sometimes.

X-Q. 392. Not a general practice?

A. We find it necessary with some oils.

X-Q. 393. And then it passes into the flotation plant and meets the circuit water? Is that right?

A. Let me understand what you mean by "circuit water."

X-Q. 394. Circuit water is the water that has been down through the tailings and has been returned. Clear water is water that has not been through the circuit.

A. Well, of course some of this oil is mixed with circuit water, under that definition, before it goes into the flotation pulp, sometimes.

X-Q. 395. But the point that you had in mind was

Frank B. Wicks.

that you sometimes agitate for specific purposes before the oil or reagent comes in contact with the ore. Isn't that what you had in mind?

A. Well, I had in mind oil distributed along the circuit water and circulating pulp or circulating loads. the reason I asked you for that definition.

X-Q. 396. What do you call the circulating load—is that the term you used, "circulating load"?

A. That is the cleaner tailings returning to the rougher, as I explained this morning.

X-Q. 397. What might well be called a return of middlings to the rougher?

A. Yes, it might be.

X-Q. 398. Now, sometimes these middlings got to the emulsifiers; is that right, and sometimes they do not?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 399. What oils do you have to treat with this extra emulsification?

A. Any oil that is viscous, that is highly viscous. That is, any of the so called low gravity oils.

X-Q. 400. For example, among the oils that you have named.

A. The Taft oil of California.

X-Q. 401. Now, in this matter of emulsification, what difference has there been, if any, before and after December 21st, 1916?

A. You are speaking of the vanner concentrate cleaner plant, of course?

X-Q. 402. Yes.

Frank B. Wicks.

A. There has been no difference in the emulsification.

X-Q. 403. And in the other plant. I notice you merely give in your list, certain operations on different days. Was that plant running right along?

A. Yes, it was.

X-Q. 404. And under what conditions was it running? You haven't given that in your table.

A. To what plant to you refer, Mr. Williams?

X-Q. 405. The plant that treats the tailings, slime tailings of the vanner?

A. On the other days which we haven't given in this tabulation, some days we run with large quantities of oil and some with small quantities, but we have not been able to get the larger quantities continually and we have had to go back to smaller quantities until we could get a sufficient supply.

X-Q. 406. And all you have given is the selected examples of the use of large quantities of oil on different occasions?

A. Those which we thought would be most representative.

X-Q. 407. Have you a full report of the operations for January? February, March and up to April 4, 1917, from which these selections have been made?

A. I am not certain if I have—I have at least a portion of them, Mr. Williams.

X-Q. 408. You have produced a table showing the operations from March 21st to March 31st, 1917. That is right, is it not?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 409. You have picked out in the list put in evidence March 21st, 1935, 1.254 tons of oil.

P. 2496, After L. 5, insert "A. Yes, Sir."

1

A. We were not running on large quantities of oil on all of the days.

X-Q. 411. What was the smallest amount of oil that you used during these days from March 21st to March 30th?

A. .55 or fifty-five one hundredths of a pound per ton.

X-Q. 412. But on March 21st, your record here is 1440 tons of ore treated. Is that right?

A. March 21st we treated 135 tons in this particular run.

X-Q. 413. But on that day, according to the report which you now show me, you treated 1440 tons? Is that right?

A. Yes, sir. That test may have represented about eight hours or such a matter. I don't remember the details of this particular test.

P. 2496, L. 26, insert "this day's operation was selected for the purpose of" before "this"

X-Q. 415. And then the figure of pounds of oil per ton for March 21st, is that the average of the whole day's operation?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. That is the average of the whole day's operation.

X-Q. 416. So that it really shows nothing, in view of the great difference between the few hours which you used 25 pounds to the ton, and the rest of the time?

A. I don't understand what you mean by saying that it shows nothing. It shows the results of this day's operations.

X-Q. 417. But it does not show what was the normal rate of oil per ton when you were using these large quantities?

A. No, this record would not show that.

X-Q. 418. And have you the record which shows that?

A. I don't know that we have a comparison between those two. This represents the average result for the full 24 hours of March 21st, from that plant while that represents the short period during which that test was made, or whatever period it may be—I don't remember the duration. It was probably made on a few drums of oil that we got as a sample for trial.

X-Q. 419. Then, on March 22nd you treated 1680 tons and the oil was present in the amount of .64 pounds to the ton of ore, is that right?

A. The amount of initial oil used that day was .64 pounds per ton of oil.

X-Q. 420. Now, on March 23d your average for the day appears to have gone up and you have no record of that in the selected list that you have given to us. Why is that?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. We did not endeavor to enumerate all of these different runs that we made.

X-Q. 421. Was the run satisfactory—with reference to the particular run with the larger quantity of oil?

A. Well, fairly satisfactory, yes. It compared approximately with the results of the other plant which was operating on the old—or the small quantity method.

X-Q. 422. But it was good—it wasn't good enough to put in the tables? Is that right?

A. I don't take it that way; it probably represented too small a tonnage.

X-Q. 423. Then I see that on March 24th the amount of oil was .60 pounds per ton? Is that right?

A. Yes, sir; we used that quantity.

X-Q. 424. And the next day .56? Right?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 425. And the next day .40?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 426. And the next day is March 27th which you have got in your selected list, and there the entire operations of the day were carried on with a large quantity of oil? Is that right?

A. Yes, sir; we made a full run, I believe, on that day and consequently this record will be identical with that.

X-Q. 427. And then the next day I notice it goes to 9.93, is that right.

A. I believe that that other test ran on through part of the day there, but I am not certain, which probably accounts for that. We used it until the oil was gone and then went back to the small quantity method.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 428. And so then probably that average for the day is increased by reason of the fact that this large quantity test ran over into that day? Is that right?

A. Very likely; I cannot recall the circumstances, but I think that is probably true.

X-Q. 429. And on the next day you drop down to .55 pounds?

A. Yes, sir, and the recovery was 38.18, and the recovery on the day when we used 10 pounds, or 9.3 pounds, 32.33; and the recovery on the day when we used the .55, which was the smallest quantity, 32.47, so that the results there are very nearly parallel.

X-Q. 430. Does this table show the oils that were used?

A. It shows the kind of oil used but it does not show the relative proportions.

X-Q. 431. What is this T. C. Sulphur?

A. That is an oil which we purchased over in California from the Tar & McCoomb Company.

X-Q. 432. And it was called Sulphur Oil?

A. I think it was designated that way by the shippers.

X-Q. 433. What kind of an oil is it?

A. It is a very viscous oil.

X-Q. 434. And as to its general nature, aside from its viscosity, its origin or character?

A. It is California oil of some kind.

X-Q. 435. Petroleum?

A. It comes from the California wells.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 436. Some derivative of California petroleum?

A. I don't know whether it is a derivative or whether it is a crude oil. We have had so many of these oils that it is hard to keep track of them.

X-Q. 437. Now, will you let me see the details of the operations of this slime vanner tailings flotation plant, at the period of the change in the other plant, commencing December 21st, 1916?

A. Do you wish to see the details of the operations of the vanner concentrating plant at the time that we made the change?

X-Q. 438. No, of the tailings plant at the time you made the change in the concentrating plant.

A. That was November 18th, 19th and 20th. Shall I mark that for you?

(Witness marks the record.)

X-Q. 439. Now turn on to December 20th and 21st.

A. There is nothing of importance you want to bring out here?

X-Q. 440. No.

A. December 21st.

X-Q. 441. From December 21st to December 31st on two days you used 1.07 pounds to the ton and the rest of the time it was less than one pound to the ton. Is that right?

A. On one day, the 25th.

X-Q. 442. And the rest of the time it is less than one pound to a ton of ore. Is that right?

A. It appears so.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 443. Now, give me the period in relation to January 7, 1917, in the slime vanner tailings plant.

A. January?

X-Q. 444. January 7th particularly.

A. January 7th.

X-Q. 445. How many tons of ore did you treat on that day?

A. In one plant we treated 1372 tons, and in another plant 2058 tons.

X-Q. 446. The one that you selected for your special list was in the latter plant, is that right?

A. Yes, sir; I believe there was some special condition about that that made it necessary to take that figure, but just what, I cannot say at this time. The metallurgical results in the other plant were better.

X-Q. 447. Where do you find in your detailed list, the oil percentages, the oil proportions that you have given in your special list, 9.72?

A. I don't find it here.

X-Q. 448. Is that a mistake?

A. That would make it necessary for me to go back to the original record in order for me to determine that. But what I think is---I don't know the reason for that; I can't account for it.

X-Q. 449. So far as you can see, the figures given there is erroneous and it should be 6.05 pounds to the ton, isn't that right?

A. There may be something in the previous—or in the report of that test that brought that quantity up to that. I don't know. These records are taken from

Frank B. Wicks.

supposedly the same record that this was taken from.

X-Q. 450. Will you look that up and see whether you have made a mistake?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 451. And if you have made a mistake, correct it?

A. It was quite unintentional.

X-Q. 452. In the plant which treats the vanner concentrates as operating commencing December 21st, 1916, what is the condition of the concentrates which you obtained as the finished concentrates, as to amount of oil? Have you any showing as to that?

A. We have no determination on the amount of oil contained in the concentrates. We, so far as I know, have never taken any samples of it.

X-Q. 453. Do you make any effort to get rid of the large amount of oil you have there?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 454. Do you use over again any of the oil that you get in these concentrates?

A. Well, I presume there is some of the oil in the concentrates that gets back into the mill system from the water which is taken from the concentrates in the de-watering operation.

X-Q. 455. That is to say, these concentrates go into what?

A. We take them first to settling tanks and then from settling tanks to filters.

X-Q. 456. And in the settling tanks the mineral sinks and the water overflows. Is that right?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 457. And the oil in excess would be apt to come to the surface would it not, and overflow with the water?

A. Well, I presume that some of the oil must go into solution in the water, probably, and quite likely goes out that way. I can't recall that I have ever seen any free oil actually floating on the water as it runs away from the tank, although such a thing might, although I never have noticed it.

X-Q. 458. So far as your observation goes the insoluble oil sticks to the concentrates in this tank?

A. It appears to. At least I have never seen any free oil floating away.

X-Q. 459. And then from the settling tank, where does the concentrate go?

A. To the filters.

X-Q. 460. And the water that is obtained by that filtration is that used over again?

A. Yes, sir, that goes back in the circulating water system.

X-Q. 461. What is the condition of that water, does it contain any insoluble oil?

A. I can't say whether it does or not. We have never had any analyses of it.

X-Q. 462. You have no exact analyses?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 463. And that water goes back into the plant?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 464. Now, what you have said as to the flota-

Frank B. Wicks.

tion plant which treats the vanner concentrates, is or is not that true of the flotation plant which treats the vanner tailings?

A. Well, the concentrates from all the flotation plants are combined and settled and filtered together.

X-Q. 465. Aside from what you have referred to as soluble oil, do you recover any oil in your operations from the concentrates?

A. We do not put the concentrates through any special process for de-oiling, or for removing the oil.

X-Q. 466. From the point of the introduction of oil in either of the plants until the end of the plant, is there any process for taking out and making use of the oil—for taking out the oil from the plant? Does it stay absolutely in the plant and in the pulp from beginning to the end—aside, of course, from what you call the returning of the middlings.

A. Except for the circulating load, there is no effort to remove the oil or dispose of the excess or in any way segregate it from the ore or from the pulp.

X-Q. 467. That is to say the oil that is found in there has to be taken care of in the plant as you have described it. There is no other way to get it out or get it back or save it, or use it over again than what you have described; is that right?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 468. Yes, sir, it is right?

A. There is no other way—that is, there is no way of segregating the oil from the pulp after it is once added except what the water will take out, and of course the circulating load, which you except.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 469. You can not tell me how much of the original oil is in the concentrates by any figure or determination that you had at any time made?

A. I don't recall that any such analysis has been made.

X-Q. 470. Take, for instance, before December 21st, was any such analysis made at any time?

A. Not within the limits of my recollection, there was no such analysis made.

X-Q. 471. And since, commencing December 21st, no analysis?

A. We have made a number. We have taken a number of samples and made a number of determinations to sort of give us practice in oil determination.

P. 2505, L. 17, insert "or systematic sampling, and systematic determination" after "tion"

nations?

A. I have none here, I think; I didn't bring them with me. I might have something, and I will see. (Witness refers to his papers). No, sir, I have nothing here.

X-Q. 473. Can you give any record of these determinations and give information in regard to them?

A. If any record was made of them I can get them. They were somewhat in the nature of practice for the chemist and I don't know whether they made records of it or not.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 474. Do you happen to know how they made the oil determination?

A. No, I don't except I know we experimented with the Soxhlet apparatus, and we made a number of determinations with extraction by ether, by beakers, and then treating the material and so on, that is, decanting the liquor and evaporating the ether.

X-Q. 475. I notice that in your list, defendant's exhibit 28, of the operations in the slime vanner tailings plant you had a heading "Other reagents, pounds per ton," and blank, nothing shown under here. Does that mean that in this plant you never used any other reagents than what you have called oils?

A. I don't believe we have ever used any other reagents in sufficient quantity to represent anything that might be recorded there. We have conducted a number of experiments with different reagents but never anything commercial nor anything of importance.

X-Q. 476. I notice that in your list, defendant's exhibit 28, of the operations of the slime vanner tailings plant, you have a heading "other reagents, pounds per ton," and blanks down under that heading, nothing showing. What is the meaning of that, and what other reagents have you used in your plant other than what you have called oils?

A. I don't know that we have ever used any other reagents in sufficient quantity to represent anything that might be recorded there. We have conducted a number of experiments with different reagents, but

Frank B. Wicks.

never anything commercial, or never anything of importance.

X-Q. 477. That is to say, from time to time you have experimented with other reagents, and never made a record of it?

A. The record probably exists, but it was in such minute quantity that in summing up those it was not any more than a bare fraction of a pound.

X-Q. 478. Now in the table showing the flotation operations on the retreatment of vanner concentrates, I see that your heading "other reagents, pounds per ton," is in every instance accompanied by some figures. That is right, isn't it?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 479. Now, what are those other reagents?

A. We used a number of them; I don't know that I can describe them.

X-Q. 480. Have you a record of them?

A. I haven't any record of them here.

X-Q. 481. You could get a record of them?

A. I don't know that I have authority to produce them, but I could get them.

X-Q. 482. What is your general recollection—your best recollection as to the other reagents that have been used?

A. We have used sodium compounds and calcium compounds.

X-Q. 483. What sodium compounds have you used?

A. We have used sodium carbonate and sodium sulphide and caustic soda, which is soda hydroxide.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 484. What calcium compounds have you used?

A. Calcium carbonate, and we have endeavored to use calcium sulphate.

X-Q. 485. What was the purpose of using these other reagents?

A. To improve the metallurgical results of the operation.

X-Q. 486. To improve the metallurgical results of the flotation operation?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 487. Your list gives under the heading "other reagents, pounds per ton," amount varying from .130 to 6.520 pounds per ton. I will ask you to supply information as to what reagents are described in these figures that you have given in the table that you have produced? Will you make your best effort to obtain that information?

A. I can obtain the information, but with reference to producing it, I would have to obtain permission, of course.

X-Q. 488. Will you endeavor to obtain that permission?

A. I will ask for it.

X-Q. 489. I will ask you later. Have you made any determinations or have you any information as to the oil going out with the tailings that flow out of the flotation plants?

A. No, we have no determinations of that.

X-Q. 490. Has your observation been that any inflammable oil goes out with the tailings?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I have never seen any—just what do you mean by insoluble oil?

X-Q. 491. Undissolved oil?

A. Well, that would be apparent on the surface?

X-Q. 492. It might be detected on the surface or it might show as an emulsification in the mass?

A. I don't recall that I have ever seen any free oil going out in the tailings stream.

X-Q. 493. The water of the tailings does not go to waste, does it?

A. No, it goes out in the tailings stream leaving the mill, and then goes to the tailings dam and is there impounded.

X-Q. 494. So that water goes back again through the mill?

A. Yes. We always see a limited amount of froth on the tailings stream; we have always seen that, even before we had flotation.

X-Q. 495. That is to say at the dam?

A. No, in the tail race, or the tailings launder leading to the dam.

X-Q. 496. But no free oil as far as you know?

A. As far as I know I never have seen any free oil.

X-Q. 497. As a matter of fact you don't know where all this oil goes to, do you?

A. That is not our object, to find out where it goes to, but to get metallurgical results and make money.

X-Q. 498. But you do know where all this oil goes?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I don't know.

X-Q. 499. How much do you use per day in your largest oil operations?

A. Well, I can easily figure it, but I don't suppose that it would amount to over two tank cars a day.

X-Q. 500. That would be how many pounds of oil?

A. About 200,000 pounds or such a matter.

X-Q. 501. 200,000 pounds of oil a day?

A. Or possibly a little more.

X-Q. 502. Do you buy that much oil and use that much oil for those days?

A. We have not been able to get it yet, but we will do so as soon as we get it lined up.

X-Q. 503. Now, take a day when you used 200,000 pounds of oil?

A. I said we would use that quantity, using it at the rate that we do use it.

X-Q. 504. Well, that would be true if you were using both your plants; is that your computation—using a large quantity of oil in both your plants, or as you are now doing?

A. Well, I had reference to the tailings plant then, of course. The flotation cleaning plant is operating steadily, because we have oil for that.

X-Q. 505. The vanner concentrates plant, that is operating steadily with large quantities of oil?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 506. How much oil are you using per day in that?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I can easily figure it from the quantity shown there. For what particular period do you wish?

X-Q. 507. Well, take a maximum day, a maximum oil proportion?

A. It is difficult to pick out a maximum day, because there are great fluctuations in the tonnage treated, as well as in the quantities of oil required.

X-Q. 508. Take the month of March. The average for that month, as you have given it is 23.73 pounds of initial oil per ton of ore?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 509. Now, take the maximum day in the month of March?

A. I haven't the record for the month of March, because that was not completed when I left Hurley.

X-Q. 510. Well, take the maximum that you have?

A. I have in February 23 pounds per ton.

X-Q. 511. Well, here is 23.5?

A. Here is one 23.89.

X-Q. 512. Take 23.89 per ton, and tell me how many tons of oil you fed into that plant on that day?

A. We treated 265 tons, and we fed at the rate of 23.89 pounds per ton. It is a matter of computation. I think I have figured it right. 6330.85 pounds of oil were fed to the plant on that day, in 24 hours.

X-Q. 513. MR. SCOTT: Please state the date and the amount of oil so that the record will be clear?

A. This quantity of oil was used on the 25th of February. The tonnage treated was 265 tons, and we used 23.89 pounds of oil per ton, making 6330.85 pounds in 24 hours.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 514. Now, that oil, so far as you know, all went to the concentrates, didn't it?

A. I don't know where it went. It did not particularly concern us, as long as it took that amount of oil to produce the result.

X-Q. 515. What was the weight of the concentrates on that day?

A. 85 tons.

X-Q. 516. And after those concentrates had gone through the filter, what became of them?

A. The concentrates stay on the outside of the filter you know.

X-Q. 517. Well, had gone through the filter treatment. I suppose you refer to the Oliver filter?

A. Yes, the Oliver type; the Portland filter. The concentrates from the filter go to the concentrate bins, and there are loaded out occasionally or conveniently into cars, and from those cars they are taken to the smelter.

X-Q. 518. That is, does your concern sell its concentrates to the smelter?

A. I have no knowledge of the business end of the company, but I have generally understood that they sell their concentrates to the smelter. Just what the agreement is by which they dispose of them I don't know.

X-Q. 519. Have you had any trouble because of the amount of oil in the concentrates?

A. I have heard of none, no, sir.

X-Q. 520. But you would hear about that?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I might hear of it and I might not. They might mention it to me, and they might not.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until Thursday morning, April 19, 1917, 10:00 a. m.

Thursday, April 19, 1917, 10:00 A. M.

Trial resumed pursuant to adjournment, all parties present; whereupon the following proceedings were had:

MR. WICKS

Resumed the stand for further

CROSS EXAMINATION (Resumed)

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

X-Q. 527. In aswering Q. 45 yesterday, you were asked whether any other oil was used besides the Barrett and the Jones, and you replied that you used a little pine tar and other things, and then in Q. 47 Mr. Scott asked you, "Did you operate at any time without the pine oil", thus changing pine tar to pine oil, probably unintentionally. You answered affirmatively, and in Q. 49 you were asked "Is this use of pine oil exceptional or general?" And you answered "It is rather exceptional." Did you intend to say pine tar throughout those questions and answers, or was pine tar a mistake, corrected by counsel?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Pine oil, as I generally consider it in my mind, includes all classes of pine oil, steam distilled, destructively distilled, and pine tar oils, and of course there are others too. In this record to which you referred I think where we mentioned pine tar that was pine tar oil, and I think that that was what was under discussion when I was talking to Mr. Scott. As far as I remember that was parallel. We do use occasionally, however, destructively distilled pine oil, which is not considered strictly a pine tar oil, but the use of any of them is rather exceptional.

X-Q. 528. Do you use a steam distilled pine oil?

Q. We have not used any steam distilled pine oil for some time.

X-Q. 529. But you have used it?

A. Yes, I think it was used in actual operation some time ago.

X-Q. 530. Is it any more expensive than the destructively distilled pine oil?

A. I don't know what the comparison is, but I believe that steam distilled pine oil is generally considered a somewhat higher priced product than the destructively distilled.

X-Q. 531. And pine tar is quite a different thing, is it not?

A. It is a somewhat more viscous oil from the distillation of pine woods.

X-Q. 532. Now, between the vanners and the commencement of the vanner concentrates flotation plant, you have a classifier as I understand from your testimony?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 533. What kind of classifier?

A. A hydraulic classifier.

X-Q. 534. Is there anything else between the vanners and the flotation plant?

A. Well, we have to thicken the classifier products to a certain extent to bring them down to approximately the right consistency for flotation treatment.

X-Q. 535. Then you have a dewatering arrangement?

A. A set of thickening tanks, to take off the excess water.

X-Q. 536. And in these thickening tanks there is an overflow of the excess water?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 537. That is the way you get rid of it?

A. That goes back into the mill, in circulation.

X-Q. 538. Now, that is all that there is, then, between the vanners and the flotation plant, the classifier and the thickener?

A. Well, of course there are pumps or elevators or whatever may be required to overcome differences in elevation.

X-Q. 539. Well, in this particular plant that you have described, for treating vanner concentrates—

A. Sometimes we operate pumps for that, and sometimes elevators, and sometimes both of them together, to convey the concentrates from the vanners back to the classifiers.

X-Q. 540. Pumps to convey the vanner concentrates to the classifiers?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. From the vanner to the classifiers; yes, sir.

X-Q. 541. Then from the classifier to the thickeners?

A. From the classifiers to the thickeners the material now flows by gravity.

X-Q. 542. And from the thickeners to the flotation plant?

A. Also by gravity.

X-Q. 543. In the first place, where, in that series of operations, is the oil added?

A. That is—after the material leaves the thickening tank it passes into a little storage tank or a little regulating tank just ahead of the flotation machines, and then the oil is added as the material leaves this little storage tank.

X-Q. 544. As it leaves that tank?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 545. So that it is added in the pipes that flow from this tank to the flotation plant; is that right?

A. In the launders.

X-Q. 546. In the launders?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 547. And no other oil is added to the pulp before it reaches these launders?

A. No.

X-Q. 548. Now, those launders go directly to the flotation plant?

A. They go right into the flotation machine, that is into the first emulsifier of the flotation apparatus.

X-Q. 549. Is there any overflow of water between the point where the oil commences to enter the pulp

Frank B. Wicks.

and the point where the pulp enters the first emulsifier?

A. No, sir; there is not.

X-Q. 550. So that every drop of oil that gets into the pulp goes into the flotation plant?

A. So far as I know, every drop of oil that is added to the feed in these launders goes into the flotation machines; yes, sir.

X-Q. 551. About how long are these launders?

A. I think that it is probably about six or eight feet between the feed tank and the emulsifier.

X-Q. 552. Does the pulp flow through the emulsifiers in series?

A. It passes through three emulsifiers in series; yes, sir.

X-Q. 553. One after the other?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 554. There is the same speed of rotation in the emulsifier, in the agitating blades, as in the other parts of the plant?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 555. Then from the emulsifiers it passes how to the first rougher machine?

A. It is fed directly into the machine and the machine throws it out into the spitzkasten.

X-Q. 556. Of course your determination of pounds of oil per ton of solids in the feed or per ton of ore, is made by taking samples of the feed and determining the amount of oil in them and determining the rate of feed? Is that right?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. Yes, sir, we take periodical samples of the feed as it leaves these feed tanks of which I spoke, and that sample is taken for determination for the tonnage and the pounds of the pulp.

X-Q. 557. Now you take the tailings from the cleaner machine and carry that back to the head of the rougher machines, do you not?

A. You are evidently confusing in your mind between the two plants, Mr. Williams. We were discussing the vanner concentrate cleaning plant, were we not?

X-Q. 558. No, no; I am talking now of the flotation plant; I have left the vanner plant.

A. That is the flotation plant which treats the vanner concentrates?

X-Q. 559. Yes. Now, in the flotation plant that treats the vanner concentrates what becomes of the tailings from the cleaner machines?

A. In that plant, Mr. Williams, we do not operate a separate set of roughers and cleaners as we do in the plant that treats the vanner tailings and which I explained yesterday. The apparatus is somewhat different in the plant treating the vanner concentrates.

X-Q. 560. I don't believe that you have described that separately.

A. I don't think that I was given an opportunity to do so yesterday, Mr. Williams.

X-Q. 561. You may do so.

A. The plant which treats the vanner concentrates receives the feed, as I have described it, and from this

Frank B. Wicks.

feed tank. The feed passes through three emulsifiers and then to the first flotation machine. Then it passes through from one flotation machine to another, down through a series of 14 cells and of course a froth is taken off of each spitzkasten belonging to each of the 14 cells. The first few spitzkastens produce a high grade, finished concentrate. The remainder of the spitzkastens, then, they produce a lower grade concentrate which constitutes the circulating load in that plant, and that is returned as a middling back into the first emulsifier by means of an elevator and joins the initial feed. Then the tailings from this plant are sufficiently low to be wasted.

X-Q. 562. You have not given us any determination of the amount of oil that was carried around into this lower grade of concentrates which go back to the head of the emulsifier.

A. I don't know the exact quantity of oil there. I know that some determinations were taken but I never considered the method very accurate. They may have been accurate but they have not been proven to be yet, so that we did not consider them sufficiently important to bring them. However, there is a large quantity of circulating oil.

X-Q. 563. And also a large quantity of circulating material?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 564. Now, as to the vanner tailing plant, there you have cleaner cells and the cleaner machines and the rougher machines, and there you take the tailings

Frank B. Wicks.

from the cleaner machines and bring them back to what point?

A. Either ahead of the emulsifier or follow the emulsifier, but in either case they join the initial feed ahead of the first flotation machine.

X-Q. 565. And that carries a great amount of solid material?

A. That carries some, but the solid material—the tonnage of solid material isn't so very great there. The volume of pulp is very considerable but it is very dilute.

X-Q. 566. What determination have you made of the amount of solid material which is thus carried along and fed into the roughers?

A. I don't know that I have this record but I will investigate. I have one sample taken on April 4th in which the cleaner tailings or the circulating load contained, in one case, 6.5% solids, and in another case 6% solids, these two samples being taken on April 4th; and I can't say the period of time over which they covered, but I think that that represented a 24-hour run. April 4th, 1917.

X-Q. 567. Now, have you any determination of the proportion of oil to solids in that circulating load?

A. In that circulating load the total volume of the pulp contained .06 and .07 per cent oil. That percentage is based on the total weight—I said volume, but I meant the total weight of the water and solids together.

X-Q. 568. That gives all the items does it not?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I think that one would be able to compute the remainder of the figures from that.

X-Q. 569. Now, if in fact the amount of solids carried around from the end of the cleaner machines back to the head of the rougher machines was one third the amount of the solids fed into the rougher machines from the vanners, and if then the proportion of oil in weight that you have given it was one third of the proportion of oil in the original feed, then you would have the condition that the proportion of oil to solids in the rougher machines would be absolutely unaltered by the circulating load?

A. That is true, Mr. Williams. We always take that tonnage of the circulating load into consideration in computing our figures of the total pounds of oil present in the machine, that is, we base it not only on the initial tonnage, but also on the tonnage circulated.

X-Q. 570. But those are not the figures you have given here?

A. They were intended to be.

X-Q. 571. Because you have given the feed to the flotation plant from the vanners. That would be the only proper estimate of the amount of material treated?

A. Pardon me; to which statement did you refer there?

X-Q. 572. The slime vanner tailings?

A. We have only given one absolute figure of pounds of oil in the circulating load.

X-Q. 573. Yes.

A. And in that one we show 3.2 pounds of oil in the

Frank B. Wicks.

circulating load per ton of initial feed. I think if those figures are computed back, you will find that due allowance was made for the tonnage of material circulated. It is quite a long calculation, however.

X-Q. 574. But your weight in dry tons of flotation headings is 3250?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 575. Your initial oil in pounds per ton is 8.10 pounds per ton of flotation headings?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 576. You have said that the amount of oil in the circulating load is at the rate of 3.2 pounds per ton of flotation headings?

A. Of initial feed, yes; based on 3250 tons.

X-Q. 577. Then you give a total oil pounds per ton as 11 plus 3, but you do not anywhere give the amount of solid material that is carried back and put into the rougher in connection with that oil. That is right, isn't it?

A. I have just given you those figures in reading from this other statement, by which you can compute that.

X-Q. 578. But you did not give them in your tables?

A. It was not considered necessary. It could be given, and I believe that I have—at least it was intended that that should include that circulating tonnage of material just the same as we include the circulating oil.

X-Q. 579. How long would it take you to satisfy yourself that your figures here are based upon the actual amount of material that was going through those rougher machines?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. I can make a computation of that and have it ready for you later, if you wish?

X-Q. 580. I will ask you to do so?

A. Very well.

X-Q. 581. Now, how many tons of pulp was returned on that particular day and in that particular operation from the cleaner to the rougher machines?

A. In one case there were 3888 wet tons of circulating load, combining water and solids, or liquids and solids.

X-Q. 582. On April 4th, 1917?

A. Yes, there was in one case, and in another case, 4165 wet tons.

X-Q. 583. Those are all of your measurements?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 584. Now you have not given a description of the apparatus between the vanner slime tailings and the flotation machine which treats those tailings. Just tell me what that apparatus is?

A. There is none at all—that is, during the greater part of this time. Just at the present time we are sending a little of our exceedingly fine slimes directly from the upper classifiers to settling tanks and then to flotation, which has the effect of bypassing the vanners, but other than that there is no cleaning or preliminary handling or anything between the vanners and the flotation plant.

X-Q. 585. Any classifying?

A. None.

X-Q. 586. All the tailings of the vanners flow directly into the flotation machine?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. As I said yesterday, there is a certain tonnage of vanner tailings that are now too coarse to be treated by flotation, and we are not treating them, because they are too coarse, and because we have not flotation capacity for them.

X-Q. 587. And you are not classifying so as to separate the fine material?

A. Well, they are treated at separate vanners anyway, so the separation takes place before the vanner treatment.

X-Q. 588. And in this slimes flotation plant, what is the exact point of the addition of the oil?

A. Just as the material passes into the emulsifier. Of course sometimes we have found that the oil was not necessary ahead of the emulsifiers, so that the emulsifiers are cut out.

X-Q. 589. Yes, you said that before. Now, I called your attention to what appeared to be an error in your table, yesterday, by comparing it with the original reports?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 590. Have you a correction to make?

A. In investigating that, I satisfied myself that the statement as submitted to the court is correct. The error was one on this other sheet, which was entirely clerical. That was on January 7th. I will call attention to the fact that in making up this statement the clerk divided the oil equally between the two plants, plant No. 1 and plant No. 4, in each case. This is ordinarily satisfactory for our daily operation, and in

Frank B. Wicks.

this particular test the statistician in the office was not familiar with the situation, and he divided the total amount of oil equally between the two plants there, which made it six and a half pounds, based on the whole tonnage treated in the two plants, but the correct figure is 9.72 pounds on the 7th for the plant in which the test was operated, and 1.70 pounds in the plant in which the test was not made.

X-Q. 591. That is to say, the test was made in one plant, and in these figures the oil was averaged up between the two?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 592. Then there is another matter that I want you to verify. The total for the fourth quarter of 1915, weight, dry tons of flotation concentrates, is given as 20,842. My calculat^ors tell me that that is a mistake; that the other figures require it to be about 2,084, a difference of some 19,000 tons. Will you verify that?

A. I believe they are wrong, Mr. Williams. I will be glad to check that over sometime if you wish.

X-Q. 593. Will you check that over and tell me later whether or not you are right? There may be some other error that explains it. Just go over that calculation, please?

A. Yes, I will. You don't wish me to calculate that now, do you?

X-Q. 594. No. Now, in this table of flotation operations of slime vanner tailings you have a heading "flotation concentrates," and "weight, dry tons": is that the weight of the concentrates dry?

Frank B. Wicks.

A. How do you mean, Mr. Williams?

X-Q. 595. Is that the weight of the concentrates alone, or does it include the weight of any liquid oil that may be with them?

A. Well, that would be hard to answer.

X-Q. 596. It is given as dry weight. Now are the concentrates dried, or are they loaded with the oil?

A. Well, I am not able to say how much oil might remain in them and how much might be volatilized in the drying operation.

X-Q. 597. You don't know?

A. No, sir; I have no means of telling that.

X-Q. 598. What is the drying operation that you speak of?

A. That is in drying your samples down for assay and analysis and so on.

X-Q. 599. Not what occurs in the machine itself; that is to say, not the filtration.

A. Well, these dry weights, of course, must be computed from the total amount of flotation concentrates shipped, and those of course must check back with the theoretical amounts from day to day within reasonable limits of accuracy, and all of the dry weights are figured by taking moisture samples of the material loaded in the cars as they are shipped, and then those samples are taken down to the laboratory and dried on a steam plate or in a steam oven, and then the loss in weight in the drying operations is considered the moisture.

X-Q. 600. So that when the samples are taken and

Frank B. Wicks.

have been absolutely dried, all the oil has been either driven off or made into a solid?

A. I don't see how the oil has anything to do with it.

X-Q. 601. You don't know what has become of the oil; that is the fact, isn't it?

A. I don't know whether it has volatilized or not, no, sir, and the percentage would be very small anyway.

X-Q. 602. I notice down in your other list you do not give us the dry weight of the flotation concentrates at all; that column is blank?

A. We had no means of segregating those figures there; that can easily be computed back, but as we have not the actual figures, we did not show them.

X-Q. 603. Those figures, if they were computed, might tell us something about the reason for the large quantities of oil, might they not?

A. They can easily be furnished, but it was a physical impossibility to get accurate samples at the time the runs were made.

X-Q. 604. Why?

A. Because it is impossible to segregate this particular concentrate from the remainder of the tonnage being shipped at that time. It would be possible to do so if the equipment at the plant permitted it, but under the present conditions it does not permit it.

X-Q. 605. You mix that up with other concentrates, is that right?

A. Yes.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 606. So you have not any reliable figures there?

A. No, sir. We could have taken dilution samples, probably, and arrived at approximate figures, or we can calculate that, if you wish.

X-Q. 607. Now, I asked you yesterday to compute the total amount of oil fed to the vanner concentrates plant on a day when the tonnage treated was 265 tons, and you used 23.89 pounds of oil per ton, and then I asked you what was the weight of the concentrates on that day and you gave me the weight 85 tons. Now, I thought you gave me the weight of the concentrates of the plant that we were talking about. Did you?

A. I did.

X-Q. 608. And 85 tons of concentrates were produced on that day from that particular plant, is that right?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 609. From those 265 tons of feed?

A. Yes, I believe that to be reasonably accurate.

X-Q. 610. Why do you say "I believe that to be reasonably accurate?"

A. Well, I did not make the measurements myself.

X-Q. 612. You don't think the method of measurement was accurate, is that the idea?

A. No, I did not mean to infer that at all; I meant that I did not have any direct personal knowledge of it, because I did not take the measurements myself; I had to depend on the boys who operate the plant and take these measurements, to compile these figures for me.

Frank B. Wicks.

X-Q. 612. I suppose that is true of a good many of the figures is it?

A. Well, naturally I cannot compile all the figures myself.

X-Q. 613. So that you cannot say of your own knowledge as to a good many of those figures, that they are accurate?

A. I can say that I have absolutely every reason to believe that they are accurate, because I have confidence in my organization.

X-Q. 614. But the work has been done by your subordinates?

A. Necessarily so.

X-Q. 615. Now, these recoveries that show in these figures they are the result of computation, are they not?

A. Yes, in that case they are.

X-Q. 616. And what is the method of computation?

A. I don't recall the formula right now that they use for that. It is that formula, I believe, developed by Dr. Gahl; I think it is the weight of the concentrates times the difference between the assay at the heads and the assay of the tailings, and that product divided by the assay of the heads multiplied by the difference between the assay of the concentrates and the assay of the tailings. That is the standard formula I believe, used in all places.

MR. WILLIAMS: For the present, if your honor pleases, I have proceeded as far as possible in the cross examination of this witness.

Frank B. Wicks.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

R-Q. 617. Mr. Wicks, referring to the vanner concentrate table, under defendant's exhibit 26, will you state whether on each and every day of the period between December 21, 1916, and March 31, 1917, the amount of oil used was in excess of 20 pounds per ton? I see we have averages here, and the question is directed to whether each and every day went above 20 pounds.

A. Every day with the exception of one day. I can verify that in a minute—every day except one, 26th of December, when, for some reason they dropped down to 18.18 pounds per ton.

R-Q. 618. Is it an easy matter to feed the oil so that you get a certain predetermined amount per ton?

A. No, sir. It is very difficult to do that. The tonnage varies considerable and the rate at which the oil will flow out of a given ^{erture}~~apparatus~~ varies considerable and the smaller the aperture the greater likelihood of fluctuation, so that it is rather difficult to maintain exact tonnages. They maintain the amount of oil more by the appearance of the plant than by the actual volume of oil going in at any one time.

R-Q. 619. Now, referring to the slime vanner tailings tabulation, defendant's exhibit 28, and to the part of the tabulation relating to the experiments between January 7th and April 4, 1917, I notice in some instances the tonnage treated in the experiment runs into

Frank B. Wicks.

the thousands and others into the hundreds only. Were these experiments carried out in different plants or parts of the same plant?

A. They were all conducted in full scale machines, that is, ordinary operating machines, but in three cases there where the tonnage is relatively small we operated only two rows out of eight rows, or one quarter of the total plant.

R-Q. 620. That was March 13th, 14th, and 21st?

A. March 13th and March 21st. The reason for that was that the quantity of oil available for the run was not great enough to make it possible to get a good length of run on the full scale.

R-Q. 621. Before leaving the plant at Hurley to come to Butte, did you come to any decision as to the future mode of operating the plant upon slime vanner tailings as a result of the experiments between January 7, and April 4?

A. Well, the results were all submitted to Mr. Sulley, the manager, and I presume it was on the basis of these results that he issued certain instructions with reference to future operations.

R-Q. 622. And what were these instructions?

MR. GARRISON: I object; how can that be relevant, if your honor pleases.

THE COURT: I think the past operations will serve the purposes of this case. The objection will be sustained.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

Oba Wiser.

OBA WISER, a witness called on behalf of the defendant, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 1. What is your full name?

A. Oba Wiser.

Q. 2. What is your occupation?

A. At the present time I have the position of metallurgist for the Chino Copper Company.

Q. 3. Are you associated with Mr. Wicks in your duties?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 4. You have heard Mr. Wicks' testimony today and yesterday?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 5. During what period, Mr. Wiser, have you been employed as metallurgist at the Hurley plant of the Chino Copper Company.

A. Since June, 1914.

Q. 6. Are you conversant with the flotation operations which are tabulated upon this sheet, "Detailed Record of Flotation Operations on the Retreatment of Vanner Concentrates", this being defendant's exhibit 26?

A. Yes, sir; I was there when the operations were conducted.

Q. 7. Throughout the period from December 8th, 1914, to date?

Oba Wiser.

A. Well, with the exception of probably two weeks' vacation in 1915 and two weeks' in 1916, I think it was away from the plant.

Q. 8. You were there during the first half of 1916, were you, and December, 1914?

A. Yes, I did not leave the plant until along in September, 1915.

Q. 9. Do you know whether the figures and results set forth here are accurately stated?

A. I think they are reasonably accurate.

Q. 10. Well, by "reasonably"—within what limits do you mean?

A. Well, insofar as it is possible for—

Q. 11. (Interrupting) You mean that they are as accurate as it is possible to make them: is that what you mean?

A. Well, I would say that, yes.

Q. 12. This is the exhibit from which we struck three or four lines on account of Mr. Wicks not having been connected with the plant during the first part of 1915, and if counsel has no objection I would like to substitute this inasmuch as Mr. Weiser has testified to the accuracy of this first part.

MR. GARRISON: I intend to interpose an objection based on the same ground as interposed with respect to the testimony of Mr. Wicks, as to the competency and relevancy of the testimony to be given by this witness. Personally, I have no objection if Mr. Williams thinks of none, for the course to be pursued by Mr. Scott with respect to that exhibit if your honor

Oba Wiser.

accepts it, but I desire to have the objection recorded before your honor rules upon the method of introducing the proof. After the objection is ruled on—

MR. KREMER: I am going to suggest, in view of the fact that there will be a number of witnesses of this same character, it might be considered that the objection is interposed instead of constant repetition of it.

THE COURT: Was there an objection to this originally?

MR. GARRISON: I don't know whether there was an objection specifically to this sheet. I gather that your honor had—

THE COURT: You object to all of this variety of testimony?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir, and I thought that it was not necessary to encumber the record by constant repetition, and object to the details unless the detail was objectionable.

THE COURT: The court must have overruled it then.

MR. GARRISON: I imagine so.

THE COURT: I will overrule it now.

MR. GARRISON: Your honor at this time understands the same as I, when I once object to the whole line of testimony from a witness, there is no necessity to renew it.

THE COURT: No, it will cover all of that.

MR. GARRISON: That is, if we had a specific objection it would cover that. My previous objection

Oba Wiser.

does not go to the offer of Mr. Scott based upon this witness. I have no objection to substituting one sheet for the other. With that understanding, Mr. Wicks' testimony only goes to so much of the sheet as is contained after the date of his employment, and that this gentleman's testimony goes to the portion before that, we have no objection to the sheet being put in, with the understanding that it is divided as to these dates.

THE COURT: Leave the old one in and put a new one in.

EXAMINATION ON VOIR DIRE.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 13. Now, Mr. Wiser, do your duties enjoin upon you to have knowledge with respect to the various matters that are set forth upon that sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 14. And have you such knowledge of your own, derived from attendance at the mill, that enables you to say that so far as you know, the various figures on this sheet are accurate and correct representations of actions which took place?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 15. Of your own personal knowledge?

A. Yes, sir, of my own personal knowledge.

Q. 16. So that if we should cross-examine you with respect to this you would not be in a position of saying that "as to that, I don't know that; that is something somebody else knows"?

A. Yes, sir.

Oba Wiser.

Q. 17. You will be able to answer the questions?

A. I think so.

MR. GARRISON: We have no objection then, on the matter of form.

MR. KREMER: We offer it and ask that it be marked the next number.

The sheet was admitted in evidence and marked
DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 29.

DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 18. Mr. Wiser, will you explain the items of this table down to the second quarter of 1915; just explain what the items mean, the first column entitled "Flotation Headings," with three subheads under.

A. Take these up just as they appear on the sheet, Mr. Scott?

Q. 19. Yes, please.

A. December 8 to 31 represents the period when we began the retreatment of vanner concentrate.

Q. 20. Two thousand three, the first item there, is the total?

A. Two thousand three tons were treated during that period, an average daily tonnage of 105. Per cent copper in the headings, 13.19; flotation concentrates produced, 588; per cent copper, 42.87—

THE COURT: What is the witness doing? Simply reading off this table that has already been introduced?

MR. KREMER: Supplements by a statement of the operations.

Oba Wiser.

THE COURT: I don't see any necessity of reading this off in detail. They are in evidence. If a question is to be based on it, proceed.

Q. 21. Were you in daily charge of these flotation operations?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 22. And the operations set forth upon this sheet were carried out under your supervision?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 23. I hand you defendant's exhibit 28. That is the tabulated statement of the treatment of slime van-ner tailings, and ask you if you were present and directly in supervision of the operations there represented throughout the period stated?

A. With the exception of the two vacations I mention.

Q. 24. Your connection and supervision covered the period beginning with April 16, 1915?

A. Yes.

MR. SCOTT: That was an item that was not proved by Mr. Wicks.

EXAMINATION ~~ON~~ VOIR ~~DIRE~~.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 25. Now, Mr. Wiser, your personal knowledge with respect to these entries appearing on defendant's exhibit 28, is such that you can personally answer questions with respect to the verity of these figures; is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Oba Wiser.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

X-Q. 26. I note that this last sheet now marked defendant's exhibit 28, that it contains your signature; how does it happen that exhibit 28 is signed by you, and exhibit 29 is signed by Mr. Wicks?

A. Mr. Wicks, I believe, had that report prepared and therefore signed it. This report I prepared myself or had prepared and I think I signed this after Mr. Wicks had left our plant.

X-Q. 27. So that the report signed by you was prepared by you?

A. Well, I had supervision of the preparation of it.

X-Q. 28. Whose business is it, or whose duty is it, in the ordinary course of business, to sign reports of this kind?

A. Well, there never has been any definite understanding as to who signs these reports. Both the metallurgical engineer and the assistant superintendent sign reports of the same character.

X-Q. 29. When did the Chino Copper Company commence to treat slime vanner tailings in their regular operations?

A. In their regular operations, the first slime vanner tailings we treated was the treatment began on April 16, 1915. I will say that for the first three or four months the operations were more of an experimental nature than they were regular operations.

X-Q. 30. Did the plant run continuously?

Oba Wiser.

A. Well, it was running continuously for the date set forth in that summary. The other days—

Q. 31. (Interrupting) The interims are just shut-downs for alterations, I suppose?

A. For alterations.

X-Q. 32. So that this report covers the whole period of the treatment of slime vanner tailings in the Chino plant?

A. Yes, sir, it covers all operations for that product.

X-Q. 33. And that is equally true as to the other report, exhibit 29, which commences December 8, 1914; that covers all the treatment—retreatments of that product, vanner concentrate, in the Chino plant?

A. Yes, sir; it covers everything.

X-Q. 34. When you started in December 8th, 1914, what machines did you have; what flotation machines?

A. We had the Janney flotation machine.

X-Q. 35. Same general type of machine or same machines that you have now?

A. About the same thing that we have now.

X-Q. 33. Of course these original machines did not have any porous medium covered chambers for the introduction of air, did they?

A. You are referring now to the machine we use in the retreatment of concentrates are you not?

X-Q. 37. I am referring to the machine that has been called the Janney Mechanical Air Machine.

A. In the retreatment plant we are using the Janney Mechanical machine exclusively.

X-Q. 38. That is, retreating what?

Oba Wiser.

A. Vanner concentrates.

X-Q. 39. It is only in the slime vanner tailings plant that you use these machines that have the air supplement? Is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 40. So these Janney machines installed December 8, 1914, were substantially the same as the machines that Mr. Wicks has described?

A. Substantially the same, having a Spitzkasten on one side only.

X-Q. 41. Then on April 16, 1915, when you started to treat the slime vanner tailings, what machines did you install?

A. That was the mechanical.

X-Q. 42. Just the mechanical machine?

A. With the double Spitzkasten, with a Spitzkasten on each side.

X-Q. 43. And when did you first put in machines with the compressed air supplement in the Spitzkasten?

A. I think that was during the period represented by July 13 to July 23d on this sheet, I am not positive, but I think that period covers the first installation of that type, with the air cells.

X-Q. 44. These air cells, have they double Spitzkasten or single Spitzkasten?

A. Well, there is an air cell in each Spitzkasten.

X-Q. 45. But are they double Spitzkasten machines, or single Spitzkasten machines?

Oba Wiser.

A. Double.

X-Q. 46. Double?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 47. Now, in this slime vanner tailings plant, how many of the machines had the compressed air addition?

A. Well, all of them that we term rougher cells have this in.

X-Q. 48. All the rougher cells?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 49. But the cleaner cells they don't have that?

A. The cleaner cells, the first two rows of machines on our pyramid type of cleaner are the mechanical machine, but the two lower rows have the air cells in them. They are all double Spitzkasten.

X-Q. 50. Do the lower machines that have the compressed air, do they make a finished concentrate?

A. Most generally. Sometimes we might circulate that product, but not very often.

X-Q. 51. That is to say, if the operation of the machines, your examination should show that it was not as good as it ought to be, you would send it back?

A. Well, sometimes it has been the custom to do that.

X-Q. 52. But that is not the general custom?

A. Not the general practice.

X-Q. 53. You haven't got with you, have you, a flow sheet of the mill or of the flotation plant?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. I haven't, Mr. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: With the reservation that was made with regard to the other witness in view of the total lack of application of his testimony, I would like to reserve the right at a future time to continue the cross examination.

MR. SCOTT: That is all.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

THOMAS A. JANNEY, a witness called on behalf of the defendant being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION,

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 1. What is your full name?

A. Thomas Addison Janney.

Q. 2. And what is your occupation?

A. Superintendent of the Arthur plant of the Utah Copper Company.

Q. ~~3~~³ At Garfield, Utah?

A. Garfield, Utah.

Q. 4. And what are your duties in that position?

A. I am in full charge of the operations of the plant.

Q. 5. And that plant is made up of a flotation department is it, and gravity concentration?

A. It is.

Thomas A. Janney.

Q. 6. How long have you held that position. Mr. Janney?

A. Since June 1, 1915.

Q. 7. And before June 1, 191⁵~~6~~, what was your occupation?

A. I was a metallurgical engineer.

Q. 8. Of the same plant?

A. Of the same plant.

Q. 9. And for how long a period were you metallurgical engineer?

A. I believe it was July 11, 1911, when I was made metallurgical engineer of the plant.

Q. 10. And, as metallurgical engineer did you have anything to do with flotation?

A. I had full charge of the flotation work.

Q. 11. The practical work and the laboratory investigation, both?

A. Both.

Q. 12. In these flotation operations, what was the nature of your first work in the laboratory?

A. Our first work in the laboratory was made for the cleaning of the low grade concentrates, which were produced by the vanner in the mill, and we worked on it in a general way trying to find a suitable oil for raising the grade of the concentrate.

Q. 13. Did your investigation extend over a long period?

A. It did.

Q. 14. For how long a period did the investiga-

Thomas A. Janney.

tion continue before any actual, full, scale operations were attempted?

A. I believe our experiments started in the early part of 1913, and we started commercial operations in February of 1914.

Q. 15. About a year of investigation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 16. In a general way, was it necessary to carry on such a protracted investigation?

A. I will correct that statement; it was the year 1915, some two years before we first started actual operations.

Q. 17. Two years of investigation in the laboratory?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 18. I asked you why it was that so much investigation was necessary.

A. When we first started in we knew nothing about the flotation process.

Q. 19. Was the literature of the art and the product accessible to you?

A. Yes.

Q. 20. You had that assistance in your first investigation?

A. I think that I did read some patents, but they were of no assistance that I could see.

Q. 21. When you started first the flotation in the plant upon a practical scale, what amount of oil did you use in a general way?

MR. GARRISON: I suppose this is as good a time

Thomas A. Janney.

as any to interpose the objection for the reasons given in the objection to the testimony of Mr. Wicks.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Plaintiff excepted.

A. Well, our oil varied from a pound and a fraction up to 80 pounds when our experiment first started.

Q. 22. By experiments do you mean operations in the mill or in the laboratory?

A. That was in the laboratory.

Q. 23. But during the first part of your mill operations what was the quantity of oil, state it generally?

MR. GARRISON: Now, your honor, I think we are entitled to have the defendant indicate to us what part of the prior art the testimony of this witness will be devoted to and with respect to which the testimony of this witness is offered.

THE COURT: What is the object of this, Mr. Scott?

MR. SCOTT: The operations of the Utah Copper Company comprise the steps that are set forth in the Everson patent, the Kirby patent, the Froment patent, and the California Journal of Technology. As to the quantity of oil, the range of oil used by the Utah Copper Company has been both more and less than that indicated in the California Journal of Technology. The agitation, the grinding of the ore, its mixture with water, the addition of the oil, the agitation, the frothing, each step is represented in the various prior art documents. If it will be of any assist-

Thomas A. Janney.

ance or serve any other purpose than delay, I would analyze all these patents for Mr. Garrison's benefit. I don't think it is necessary or profitable to do that at this time.

THE COURT: This case, of course, is being tried virtually the same as though the Hyde case never existed. Certainly the Hyde case was brought after this time, and we understand of course that it is the state of the prior art at the time the complainant's patent prevailed which is in question. Under the statement of Mr. Scott I think he is proceeding fairly. The objection is overruled.

Plaintiff excepted.

A. We used in the neighborhood of from two to eight pounds.

Q. 24. That was for what period of time?

A. That covers a period from 1915 up to and inclusive of December 21st, 1916.

Q. 25. Is the memorandum or table that you are consulting something that was prepared under your direction?

A. It was prepared under my direction, yes.

Q. 26. You have knowledge of its accuracy, have you?

A. Not to every figure, but I have no reason to believe that they are not accurate.

Q. 27. They were prepared under your supervision, and they are figures which you rely upon in your business, are they?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Absolutely.

Q. 28. To that extent you can testify to the accuracy of the figures here set forth?

A. I can.

MR. SCOTT: I offer this tabulation in evidence at this time for the convenience of all parties, as the testimony will be based on it.

MR. GARRISON: A word of cross examination before it is admitted.

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 29. Mr. Janney, is your relationship toward the various things set forth on this paper such that of your own knowledge you can disclose to us the source of the information and the accuracy of the results as tabulated upon this sheet?

A. I might explain that during the year 1915 I was not at the plant, but I have been there the balance of the time.

Q. 30. Then with respect to all of 1915 you have no personal knowledge?

A. I have no personal knowledge, except that I know the results are correct.

MR. GARRISON: We object to the introduction of this document which has records for ever month in 1915.

MR. SCOTT: Yes. I will offer it subject to further proof.

Q. 31. Who was in charge at that time?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. My brother, Frank G. Janney.

MR. SCOTT: I offer it provisionally, subject to proof by Mr. Frank G. Janney.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 32. With respect to everything that appears on this sheet headed "Utah Copper Company, Arthur plant, February 1st, 1915, to April 8th, 1917, inclusive," is the fact of your personal knowledge with respect to the operations of this plant such that you can testify as to the sources of these figures and their accurate representation of the truth?

A. I can except for a few days in the month of May, 1916, and a few days in October and November, when I was away from the plant.

Q. 32½. Then, otherwise, when you would be present, you have information in regard to these operations which would enable you to answer the questions concerning the results and the accuracy of these representations?

A. I am.

MR. GARRISON: I have no objection to the form, except the objection that I stated.

THE COURT: It will be admitted and it may be used by the witness to the extent of what he says he has knowledge of.

Tabulation presented by Mr. Janney marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 30, and admitted in evidence.

Thomas A. Janney.

BY MR. SCOTT:

MR. SCOTT: As far as the mere explanation of the table goes, I presume I may ask for the witness' comments on it, that is, its meaning and significance.

Q. 33. I notice the first column is headed "estimated tons treated." State in a general way how you estimate that tonnage?

A. Our plant is so arranged that during the time mentioned, from February 1915, up to and inclusive of December 1st, 1916, that we could not take a tonnage sample of the material treated, but from our assays we calculated the amount of concentrate produced. At the Magna plant of the Utah Copper Company, they took tonnage samples of the concentrate treated in flotation, and they compared that with the tonnage treated in the large mill proper, and inasmuch as the flow sheet of the mills are practically the same, we used their factor in order to determine the tonnage for the months mentioned.

Q. 34. Now, I notice that the upper part of this table, beginning February, 1915, and extending to December 21st, 1916, the amounts of oil range below six pounds; in the part of the table below, covering the period from December 22nd to April 8th, I notice two oil columns, one headed "new" and the other headed "circulating." I would like to have you explain the meaning of the circulation oil items, if necessary explaining the layout of the plant first, to make it clear?

A. Up to and including July 11th, 1916, we had one flotation plant in operation for the treatment of our low

Thomas A. Janney.

grade concentrates, consisting of two emulsifier cells and thirteen frothing cells; from July 12th, 1916, to April 8th, 1917, inclusive we had two plants in operation for treating the same material. The second plant is composed of two emulsifiers and fifteen cells. The low grade concentrates, which concentrate we feed to these plants, is the overflow from the mineral classifier, which classifies the low grade concentrates produced by the vanners in the mill; which overflow is removed to two forty-four foot Dorr thickeners. The overflow from the Dorr thickeners is sent to waste; that is, it is not returned in the circuit, and the thickened product is divided and sent in approximately equal proportions to the two flotation plants. The feed going to our old plant runs by gravity from the Dorr tank, but the feed going to the new plant is pumped, due to a difference in the elevation of the plant and the Dorr tank. The pulp from the Dorr tank enters first the emulsifier, where oil is added, and then goes to the second emulsifier, thence to the first cell of the series of frothing cells. A high grade concentrate is made by the first few cells, and the balance of the concentrate produced is returned through our retreatment plant, thence back to the Dorr thickener.

Q. 35. Returned to what?

A. To the mechanical treatment plant where the vanner concentrate is classified. The flotation plants are so arranged that the middling will return to the mechanical treatment plant, and is elevated to the classifier and the overflow is then returned to the

Thomas A. Janney.

Dorr thickeners, as previously explained, in that way the middling is kept in circulation.

Q. 36. And the thickened product goes where?

A. It goes back to the head of the flotation machine.

Q. 37. And that is what you call the circulating load, is it?

A. Yes, sir; it joins the original feed when it enters the classifier. The concentrate made by the first few cells is sent to a Portland filter and the tailings are rejected.

Q. 38. Now, the question that I started out with was this heading of the table "New oil" and "circulating oil." Will the explanation of the machine so far given enable you to explain about the circulating oil?

A. I think so.

Q. 39. Suppose you tell us about that?

A. The concentrate which goes from the lower cells, which I spoke of as the middling, is sampled, and the quantity of the middling is determined by tonnage samples, and from this sample we determine the amount of oil which was in the flotation middling. Now, this column "new oil" is the amount of oil added for each ton of new feed entering the flotation machine.

Q. 40. That is, excluding the middling?

A. Yes, excluding the middling.

Q. 41. So much per ton of absolutely new material?

A. Yes, sir. The figures under the circulating

Thomas A. Janney.

oil column are the figures which we credit as new oil. Now, we get that credit in this way: we figure that each ton of middling should carry twenty pounds of oil per ton, and all the oil in excess of that we credit as new oil and we credit that to our new tonnage.

Q. 42. That is why you have this tonnage column in which you have added up the new oil and the circulating oil.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 43. What would you do in the event the middling would not carry its own share of the oil—that is carry less than twenty pounds?

A. Then we would have to add more new oil to make up the deficiency.

Q. 44. More than that necessary for the original feed, you mean?

A. Yes, sir. That is, we try at all times to have twenty pounds of oil per ton of material in the machine.

Q. 45. Whether the oil goes there with the middlings or is original oil?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 46. Will you make a comparison from a metallurgical viewpoint of the results prior to December 22nd, and those beginning on December 22nd and extending to date?

A. From the time we started the plant, and up to and inclusive of December 21st, we rejected tailings from the flotation plant which assayed .361 per cent copper, and produced a concentrate that contained

Thomas A. Janney.

26.800 copper, and made a recovery of 96.57 per cent. During this period we used 3.76 pounds of oil per ton. Covering the period from December 22nd, 1916, to April 8th, 1917, we treated 63,176 tons of material, and rejected a tailing that assayed .238 per cent copper, and produced a concentrate containing 22.180 per cent copper, and made a recovery of 96.60 per cent, using 21.98 pounds of oil per ton.

Q. 47. Which operation represents the most profit—that is, which class of operation?

A. Well, the method which I will designate as the twenty pound method. When we used 3.76 pounds of oil per ton we rejected a tailing that contained 7.22 pounds of copper per ton, and with the method using 20 pounds of oil, or what I have designated as the twenty pound oil method, we rejected a tailing which only contained 4.76 pounds of copper per ton, which shows an additional saving of 2.46 pounds of copper.

Q. 48. Taking into consideration other factors would the large amount of oil show a greater profit?

A. It would.

Q. 49. Mr. Janney, the figures given for copper, iron, insolubles, tailings, etc., are percentages, are they not, all through?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 50. I see the per cent indication is omitted from the copy that I have, but all these figures are percentages, are they not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 51. In the answer you have just given you applied

Thomas A. Janney.

those percentages to a ton of 2000 pounds and made your calculation that way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 52. During this period from December 22nd to April 8th for which you have monthly averages, can you state whether large amounts of oil—considerably larger than are shown in the average—were used on any individual days?

A. From April 1st to April 8th we were making some special experiments, and during that time we used very small quantities and very large quantities. That is why the tailing assay is much higher than during the previous months.

Q. 53. You mean on account of the fact that you were performing experiments?

A. Yes, you see here I used a very small quantity of oil in this case, and the tailings are very high, and those results are included in this average.

Q. 54. Have you the statement of those experiments?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 55. Were these experiments performed by you personally or under your personal direction?

A. Under my personal direction.

MR. WILLIAMS: Where were these experiments performed and when?

MR. SCOTT: If you will be patient, Mr. Williams, I will ask him.

MR. WILLIAMS: I object to testimony about experiments, which can so easily and readily be performed in court, as secondary.

Thomas A. Janney.

MR. SCOTT: If you will wait a minute, he will calm you.

Q. 56. Where were these experiments done, and in what kind of plant?

A. In the same plant that I have just testified to.

Q. 57. That is the full sized flotation plant of the Utah Copper Company?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: Will you give us access to that plant for examination when we wish it?

MR. SCOTT: Certainly, to where these experiments were performed and these runs.

MR. WILLIAMS: And the other one of which he has testified?

MR. SCOTT: We will let you see what pertains to this case and the flotation matters he has testified about.

MR. WILLIAMS: The objection will be withdrawn.

Q. 58. MR. SCOTT: Are the results set forth in this statement which you have in your hand correct to your knowledge?

A. They are.

MR. SCOTT: I offer a copy of the statement in evidence to which the witness is referring.

Table admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT No. 31.

Q. 59. Now, Mr. Janney, I think I will let you explain in your own way the purpose of these experiments and what you did, but before starting in I wish to ask

Thomas A. Janney.

you as to the character of the apparatus and the scale of the operation and what was done with the concentrates?

A. In these experiments I had to take all the feed that was going to the flotation plant, and that was controlled by the amount of ore treated in our mill, and the concentrates produced were sent to the smelter as in all cases with our concentrates, and the tailings were rejected. The plant that I performed these experiments in was the regular plant used for cleaning the concentrates, and no alterations or changes were made in any respect.

Q. 60. Were any changes made in the mode of operation of the plant?

A. None whatsoever. We tried to operate the plant to get the best results we could in each case. There were a few conditions varied probably in the dilutions of the pulp, but that was done to accomplish the best results we could. On the day shift of March 30th—

Q. 61. The dates do not appear here, do they?

A. I noticed last night that the dates were not there but I will testify as to the dates.

Q. 62. They are all numbered in a serial order from one to thirteen?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 63. Were these things done on succeeding days?

A. No. Whenever an experiment would come to my mind that I would like to perform, I carried it out.

Thomas A. Janney.

Q. 64. Well, then, if you refer to them by dates you better tell us what number it is here so we will know.

MR. WILLIAMS: Go down consecutively.

A. I will go down consecutively. Experiment No. 1 covered a period of eight hours on the day shift of March 30th. We treated 151 tons of dry feed. We used 1.6 pounds of oil per ton of new feed and we credited to our new feed 6.31 pounds of oil which was contained in the circulating feed.

Q. 65. Before we go on: Was that 6.31 in the circulating feed on the basis of the 20 pounds as you explained a moment ago?

A. No, sir

Q. 66. In that event, you haven't added the oil in the circulating load?

A. We determine the total oils—we determined the total amount of oils in the circulating load and considered that amount as new oil. There was no reason to credit 20 pounds of oil to these experiments because we were trying to get a certain number of pounds of oil per ton. The total oil used per ton of new feed was 7.91 pounds and the total pounds of oil per ton of total feed which includes the circulating feed with the initial feed was 6.87 pounds.

Q. 67. So that the column "per ton total feed" represents, takes into consideration all the oil, does it and all of the solids, does it, whether circulating or not?

A. Yes, sir. During that period the tailings rejected contained 1.577 copper and the concentrates pro-

Thomas A. Janney.

duced contained 18.325 per cent copper, and the indicated extraction was 71.07. I might mention that the oils used for these experiments from 1 to 13 inclusive was a mixture of oil composed of 59 per cent smelter fuel oil. It is an oil that comes from California which the smelter at Garfield uses as fuel oil and thirty per cent of Jones oil which is a topped petroleum oil and comes from Oklahoma. By a "topped oil" I mean an oil that has had the gasoline and kerosene removed; and ten per cent American Creosote No. 2 which is a coal tar derivative, and one per cent Yaryan pine, which is a steam distilled pine oil.

Q. 68. Steam distilled?

A. Yes, sir, it is not destructively distilled. Would you like me to testify to all of these results?

Q. 69. I would like you to make a comparison, briefly, of the different experiments in the first tabulation, as to the amount of oil and as to the tailings and grade of concentrates, and the indicated extraction?

A. Experiment No. 6 was made on the 25th of March, duration of the test was twenty-four hours.

MR. WILLIAMS: What number was that, 6?

A. No. 6. The total oil used for that test was 20.97 pounds per ton of total feed. The tailings rejected contained .141 per cent copper.

Q. 70. MR. SCOTT: How does that compare with the tailings in this first experiment, on the first days when you used six pounds and eight tenths of oil per ton?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Was very much lower, very good results. I might mention that during that twenty-four hours we treated 627 tons of ore, initial ore.

Q. 71. Is there any general trend in the character of these results as the quantity of oil is varied?

A. The results improved as the quantity of oil was increased. In this particular test we made a 97.76 per cent recovery against 71.07 when we used 6.87 pounds per ton. The grade of concentrate was 24.50 per cent copper against 28.10.

Q. 72. No, you read the wrong figure, didn't you; didn't you read out of the "iron column" instead of the "copper" when you said 24.5?

A. It should read 18.692 per cent copper against 18.325 per cent copper. I will just take two or three experiments at random.

Q. 73. Suppose I put a question or two to you, Mr. Janney. I notice that the variation in the amounts of oil in these thirteen experiments is from 6.87 pounds to 96.46 pounds and that the increase in the different runs has been made in fairly regular increments. Now, can't you give us a brief statement as to the effect of that increase in oil upon the tailings and the concentrates and the extraction, as an entirety without reading the individual figures in all cases?

A. As the oil was increased in these experiments the result—the tailings rather were lower and the grade of the concentrates remained practically the same and the recovery increased. That is up to experiment No. 7

Thomas A. Janney.

where we used 25.50 pounds of oil per ton, total tonnage. And the results were even comparable down to where we used 59.39 pounds of oil per ton of total feed. In that case the tailings contained 1.66 per cent copper and the concentrate contained 17.099 per cent copper, and the recovery was 97.26 per cent. Our tonnage was 572 tons per twenty-four hours.

Q. 74. Was there any falling off in the character of the results as you get to the extreme quantity of oil, 96 pounds?

A. The tailing was a little higher when we used 96.46 but still it was a commercial result, tailing contained .272 per cent copper and the concentrate was slightly lower.

Q. 75. Are the concentrates with that materially larger quantity of oil, 96, than in any other one of the experiments?

A. Well, the concentrate is practically the same you might say.

Q. 76. I notice they were lower with some of the smaller amounts of oil than with 96 pounds?

A. The concentrates throughout the whole test were practically the same. The difference is very small.

Q. 77. That is, speaking from a business standpoint, you would regard them just about the same, the concentrates?

A. Yes, sir, the concentrate in each case is commercial concentrate.

Q. 78. Now, what was the purpose of these experi-

Thomas A. Janney.

ments in the last group, No. 14 to 19 entitled "using 91 per cent American creosote No. 2, and 9 per cent Yaryan pine"?

A. These tests were made to determine if it were the American creosote and pine oil that brought about these good results.

Q. 79. You mean independently, do you?

A. Yes, sir; that is to say, I wanted to determine if this smelter fuel and Jones oil played any part in the production of the good results.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until 2:00 p. m., of this day, Thursday, April 19, 1917.

2.00 P. M., April 19, 1917.

MR. JANNEY.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed).

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 80. Mr. Janney, I don't think I asked you the description of the material this low grade concentrate, which is the subject of these experiments with large quantities of oil—what that is, that low grade concentrate.

A. That is the overflow from the mineral classifier.

Q. 81. About what degree of fineness is it?

A. There is only 2% of the material that will

Thomas A. Janney.

stay on a 65 mesh screen, having an opening of .0082 inches.

Q. 82. Have you any figures as to how much will pass through finer screens?

A. 36% will pass through a 200 mesh screen, having an opening of .0020 inches.

Q. 83. Will you state once more the object of these experiments, numbered from 9 to 14, in this summary of results of experiments on low grade concentrates?

A. The oil used in these experiments was a mixture made up of American creosote No. 2 and Yaryan pine oil, which was used with the smelter fuel, and Jones oil in the experiments from 1 to 13 inclusive. My object in using this oil in these experiments was to determine whether or not this oil alone was responsible for the high recovery made.

Q. 84. That is, whether the American creosote and Yaryan pine did the work or not? And so you used them alone to find out?

A. Yes, and I tried to use the amount that was used in certain experiments, numbered 1 to 13. Take, for example, experiment No. 14, in which I used .61 of a pound of oil composed of American creosote No. 2, and Yaryan pine; that would correspond to experiment No. 1; that is, .61 of a pound would approximate the amount of this oil mixture used in experiment No. 1.

Q. 85. Just explain that a little. In experiment No.

Thomas A. Janney.

I the total oil was 1.39 pounds. Now what relation has this .61 to that?

A. The total used in experiment No. 1 was 6.87 of oil.

Q. 86. Oh, yes, 6.87. What relation has this .61 pounds in experiment 14, to 6.87 pounds in experiment 1?

A. In experiment 1 it will be noted that in the oil used there was 11% of oil composed of American creosote No. 2 and Yaryan pine, and 11% of 6.87 would be .76; so the experiment No. 14, in which I used .61 pounds of American creosote and Yaryan pine, would approximate that figure.

Q. 87. Explain why you did not get the exact amount in experiment 14 that would correspond to 11% of 6.87 pounds in experiment 1?

A. You can not tell exactly how much ore is going through the machine; and we have to calculate the amount as near as possible.

Q. 88. Now, if I understand you, that .61 pounds in experiment 14 of creosote and pine mixture, corresponds roughly to the amount of those same two oils in the mixture used in experiment 1

A. It comes very close.

Q. 89. That was the purpose of the experiment?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 90. Now you may proceed and describe the relation between the others, if you wish to.

A. In experiment No. 14, in which I used .61 pounds

Thomas A. Janney.

of American creosote No. 2, and Yaryan pine oil, I treated 53 tons in two hours, and the tailings rejected contained 3.433% copper.

Q. 91.¹ How does that compare with the tailings obtained when you used these same two oils with the addition of smelter fuel and Jones oil?

A. It was over twice as high.

Q. 92. Now you may compare the extraction.

A. The extraction made while using .61 creosote and Yaryan pine was 29.54%, while in experiment No. 1 the recovery made in that extraction was 71.07, showing that the recovery was more than twice as high.

Q. 93. When you used the mixture including all four of the oils?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 94. Now, do these other experiments numbered from 5 to 19, correspond in quantity of creosote and pine, with the amount of those ingredients used in some of the experiments between 1 and 13?

A. Approximately, yes.

Q. 95. Indicate which ones correspond, or if you have a column which indicates that, just point it out and name it—I see a column here at the right which says: "Refer to Exp." Is that the column that indicates the corresponding experiment?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 96. The numbers in the column as I have it—it has been corrected—are, reading from the top, 1, 3,

Thomas A. Janney.

4, 5, 6 and 8. Is that the corrected form, the proper form?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. 97. Now, just make a comparison between, say, experiment 19 and experiment 8 in the matter of efficiency of the two operations.

A. In experiment No. 8 the tailings rejected contained .251% copper, while in experiment No. 19 the copper contained in the tailings was 1.217%.

Q. 98. That is about four or five times as much?

A. That is about five times as much.

Q. 99. And how about the extraction in those two cases, Nos. 19 and 8?

A. In experiment No. 8 the extraction was 95.19, while in experiment No. 19 the extraction was 84.02%.

Q. 100. Something over 10% under?

A. Yes.

Q. 101. What is the purpose of the last experiment recorded here, No. 20, in which you used 60% of smelter fuel and 40% of Jones oil?

A. The object of that experiment was to determine whether this oil alone could produce any results.

Q. 162. Does that experiment at the bottom of the page No. 20, correspond in the amount of smelter fuel and Jones oil with any experiments between 1 and 13? I see you have 17.84 pounds of oil in No. 20. Does it compare with No. 6?

A. I think that is the closest one.

Q. 103. And how have you found out, by taking what per cent of the twenty—

Thomas A. Janney.

A. (Interrupting.) The object of running this test, Mr. Scott, was to determine if 20 pounds of this oil alone would bring about a commercial result.

Q. 104. Regardless of the comparison with the other?

A. There was no comparison between the two experiments.

Q. 105. And compare the results you thus obtained, using the fuel experiments, as to concentrate, tailings and extraction?

A. In that test I endeavored to use twenty pounds of oil, but we were off on our calculations and it only amounted to 17.84 but even though the oil was a little low it compared very favorably with the test in which I used other oil and fuel oil and Jones oil. Take for example No. 4, the tailings are practically the same although the oil is greater comparably. In one it was 14.53 pounds against 17.84.

Q. 106. But the 14.53 in experiment No. 4 is of the entire mixture, containing the four ingredients?

A. Yes, sir. Experiment No. 6, if we eliminate the American creosote and the Yaryan pine we would get approximately the same amount of oil that was used in experiment No. 24. In experiment No. 6 the tailings was fourteen hundred against the .306 in experiment No. 20.

Q. 107. Showing the entire mixture was more efficient than the smelter fuel and Jones oil alone?

A. Yes, sir. Smelter fuel and Jones oil lack froth-

Thomas A. Janney.

ing prop^eerties, properties to bring about the whole recovery.

Q. 108. And that is contributed by the other ingredients, the creosote and the Yaryan pine?

A. Yes, Yaryan pine and creosote is used to produce the bubbles or create the froth, although this froth produced in experiment No. 20 was identical, but with a little more frothing oil added to it I would get a much better result.

Q. 109. You mean identical in what, appearance?

A. Yes, sir. You had your air bubbles with the mineral attached to it.

Q. 110. Well, from this tabulation, exhibit 31 that we are considering, would it appear that the smelter fuel and the Jones oil contributed more to the result than the American creosote and the Yaryan pine?

A. It would seem that the smelter fuel and the Jones oil contributed the most to the result because 95.09 recovery was made by its use alone.

Q. 111. Compare that with the recovery which was made in experiment 13 where you used 96.46 pounds of oil per ton you find what?

A. In experiment 13 where we used 96.46 pounds of oil per ton of feed the recovery was 95.39 per cent; while in the case of experiment No. 20 the recovery was 95.06.

Q. 112. And how about the comparison between the copper in the tailings.

A. Experiment No. 13 the copper in the tailings was

Thomas A. Janney.

.272; while in experiment No. 20 the copper in the tailings was .306.

Q. 113. This morning, in discussing the method of figuring tonnages, you stated that a factor had been established at the other mill, the Magna mill which you used in the Arthur mill. Are you certain that that is the method of calculating tonnage at the Arthur mill?

A. After leaving the court room I began to think about it and I was not sure as to whether that factor was established at the Magna mill or whether we had established it at the Arthur plant after we started taking the tonnage samples.

Q. 114. But in either event there is a factor established and that you used as a basic of calculations?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 115. Is there any peculiarity about the ore of the Utah Copper Company, which you are accustomed to handle at the Arthur mill and Magna mill?

A. In one particular, regarding flotation. I have found that our ore is much more difficult to treat when it is freshly crushed than it is after it has been allowed to stand in water for several days. The age of the ore in the presence of water seems to make it much more amenable to treatment than when it is freshly crushed.

Q. 116. Well, in actual practice, how long has the ore been crushed and subject to moisture before it does reach your flotation department?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. It would be just the matter of a few hours.

Q. 117. Long enough to assist any in the flotation operation?

A. I think not.

Q. 118. You think it could be handled better if the time interval was lengthened?

A. Yes, sir. I know it to be a fact.

Q. 119. Have you operated the Arthur plant or any part thereof upon slime feed with varying quantities of oil and in a manner similar to that you have just described with reference to the low grade concentrate?

A. I have.

Q. 120. This work was done by yourself personally or under your supervision, was it?

A. Under my supervision.

Q. 121. Have you recorded the result?

A. I did not record the results myself, but I had them tabulated.

Q. 122. You have a record of that with you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 123. Similar to the copies I have?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 124. You know of your personal knowledge, do you, that this record is a correct record of what was done?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 125. And it is so correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Thomas A. Janney.

MR. SCOTT: I presume there is no objection at all other than the original objection to this exhibit?

MR. WILLIAMS: It is understood that the objection, having been stated, need not be repeated every time.

THE COURT: The record will so show.

Record of operations of Arthur plant admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 32.

Q. 126. MR. SCOTT: This tabulation which has been received in evidence as exhibit 32 is entitled: "Summary of results obtained from commercial experiments on slime feed." Will you please explain what this slime feed is?

A. Why, the ore, as it comes from the mine, is in sizes ranging from two feet square, approximately, and we reduce it in our coarse crushing plant to approximately three quarters of an inch and it is fed to our fine bins where it is recrushed in ball mills in our flotation section. The product from the ball mill goes over what we call a Garfield roughing table where the coarse mineral is removed. The tailings are elevated to a classifier—I might mention it is a hydraulic classifier—and the coarse sands are returned to Chilean mills and ball mills for regrinding. The overflow from the classifier goes to a 75 foot Dorr tank and the sand products of the classifier which are fine enough for concentration are treated on a vanner. The tailings from the vanner are sent to waste and the concentrate is sent to our retreatment plant.

Thomas A. Janney.

Q. 127. That is the plant you have just described?

A. That is the plant I have just described. And the thickened product from the Dorr tank constitutes our flotation slime feed.

Q. 128. About what degree of fineness is this?

A. Approximately 75 per cent will pass through a 200 mesh screen.

Q. 129. That is regarded as very fine slime, is it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 130. Did that present any difficulty in the way of flotation treatment other than the difficulties encountered in treating the low grade concentrate?

A. We had a great deal of trouble in working out a process for the treatment of this slime. Our experiment started, I believe, in the early part of 1913 in the laboratory and in the latter part of 1914 we built a slime plant at the Magna plant of the Utah Copper Company, and at that time I had charge of the operation.

Q. 131. Well, during that period what amount of oil were you using—about a year, wasn't it, you named in the investigation?

A. We used various amounts of oil. In 1914 the oil we used was in the neighborhood of one to five pounds.

Q. 132. Per ton?

A. Per ton, if my memory serves me correctly, we were not able to get any kind of a result there

Thomas A. Janney.

that would be consistent. One day we would get a low tailing and the next day our tailing would be high, and it was not until April, 1915, that we finally were able to treat our slime successfully.

Q. 133. 1915, that was, wasn't it?

A. It was 1915, I think it was. And then at that time we discovered a combination of oils and acid that gave us good results. Previous to April of 1915—no, it was April of 1916. I was not at the plant in 1915—April, 1916. We had tried all kinds of creosote oil, pine oils, petroleum oils and almost every oil that we could get a hold of. We tried in combination with these oils certain alkalies, tried it in a neutral state and also in the presence of acid; and in April 1916, we discovered that by sulphinating a creosote oil and pine oil in the proportion of 95 per cent Barrett oil, which is a creosote oil, and five per cent pine oil and the use of acid we could get excellent results.

Q. 134. Have you since discovered any other combination of oils that are as efficient as this particular one that you have described?

A. Recently we have discovered that by using a large quantity of certain oils we can get very good results.

Q. 135. Is that the limit of the different ways you get at it—this particular oil that you have just mentioned—that kind of oil that you say you have used lately?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Yes. Well, in July, 1915, on the 30th of the month, and previous to this time we had found some oils that would give us very good results, but we could not operate on account of the expense.

Q. 136. What caused the expense?

A. The large amount of oil required, and we had to use a certain oil, a special oil which we sulphinated, and we also had to use an alkaline solution.

Q. 137. How much of that oil did you have to use?

A. We used all the way from—I think it is two pounds up to 27.42.

Q. 138. And which amount gave the best results?

A. We had to use a large amount of oil.

Q. 139. I don't know just what you mean by a large amount.

A. Well, around 13 pounds.

Q. 140. Now, referring to this tabulation, exhibit 32, relating to the slime treated, is the oil mixture recorded upon that sheet the same as that which you used in your large amount of oil experiments on the low grade concentrate?

A. It is not the same oil.

Q. 141. You did not find the same oil applicable to both kinds of material?

A. No, sir.

Q. 142. What was the purpose of these experiments numbered from 21 to 29?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. I had found from laboratory tests, using large quantities of oil, and I wanted to verify my results on a larger scale of operation, and that was the purpose of these experiments.

Q. 143. Did these large scale operations of the mill coincide with what you had concluded from your laboratory work?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 144. Will you give a statement of the effect you found from increasing the amount of oil in these successive experiments from 21 to 29?

A. I found that after we got above 56 pounds of oil per ton the results were practically the same.

Q. 145. The concentrates in the last three there, 27, 28 and 29, where the amount of oil was 56 pounds or above, were what in copper?

A. Experiment No. 27, in which we used 56.99 pounds of oil per ton, the concentrate assayed 16.400% copper. In experiment No. 28, where I used 78.40 pounds of oil per ton, the copper in the concentrate was 14.30. In experiment No. 29 where I used 99.43 pounds of oil per ton, the concentrate assayed 15% copper.

Q. 146. Now how did the tailings vary with the increase of oil from experiment 21 to 29?

A. Their copper content lowered as the amount of oil was increased, with the exception of one day.

Q. 147. And that was which one?

A. That was experiment No. 22.

Q. 148. I see in experiment 22 the tailing went up; that is, with the smaller amount of oil in experiment 21,

Thomas A. Janney.

the tailing was .18, and in experiment 22, with 11.36 pounds, the tailing went up to .475, and that after that there seems to be a general decrease in the tailings with the increase of the oil. Can you explain that irregularity in any way?

A. There are certain conditions that may arise in the plant—

Q. 149. You don't know the precise condition, do you?

A. No, I don't.

Q. 150. But with that exception, the increase of oil seems to accompany a decrease in the tailing, does it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 151. At the bottom of this sheet, exhibit 32, there are 4 experiments recorded, as 30 to 33 inclusive. Will you state the purpose of those, and how they served that purpose?

A. In experiment 21 to 29 I used a mixture of oil composed of a mixture made up of 60% No. 34 degree paraffine base distillate, and 40% of gilsonite, and another mixture composed of 95% Barrett No. 4 creosote and 5% Yaryan pine. These two mixtures were combined in the proportion of 98 and 2% respectively.

Q. 152. As indicated at the head of the sheet?

A. Yes, and in experiments No. 30 to 33 inclusive, I used a mixture of oil composed of 95% Barrett No. 4 creosote and 5% Yaryan pine oil.

Q. 153. Corresponding with the second ingredient of the mixture used above?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Yes. My object in running these experiments, 30 to 33 inclusive, was to determine whether or not this particular mixture of Barrett No. 4 creosote and Yaryan pine was responsible for the high recovery made.

Q. 154. And what did you find out from these experiments?

A. I found that the amount of Barrett creosote and Yaryan pineoil used in experiment 21 to 29 inclusive was not responsible for the high degree of recovery.

Q. 155. As a matter of fact how do the recoveries compare?

A. Well, they are not comparable at all.

Q. 156. These recoveries are correctly stated here, are they, 9.88% and .69%, and 16.40% and 1.33%?

A. Yes.

Q. 157. That is practically nothing in the way of a recovery is it?

A. I would not consider it a good recovery. Those oils were used in that mixture merely as frothing agents.

Q. 158. Can you state what your conception is of a frothing agent as determined—as distinguished from an oil that is not a frothing agent?

A. I have run across a great number of oils that in themselves do not possess the properties of creating froth when they are agitated, but they have a quality or property of selecting the mineral from the gangue. Then there is another class of oils which I call frothing agents, which are capable of producing froth, and making the air bubbles stable.

Thomas A. Janney.

Q. 159. But do they necessarily gather up the mineral?

A. Well, these particular oils themselves have a slight selective action, but the degree of recovery is very low.

Q. 160. As here in experiment 32?

A. Yes, sir, the Barrett creosote and Varyan pine.

Q. 161. Those are frothing agents?

A. Yes.

Q. 162. And in that particular instance, did they seem to do much besides contribute the frothing quality?

A. They did not, or they would have made a higher recovery.

Q. 163. How many oils or mixtures of oils do you know that will be operative in flotation of this slime feed of the Utah Copper Company?

A. There are two oils—two mixtures of oils, rather, that can be operated on a commercial scale, economically.

Q. 164. Are those the ones you have mentioned, the sulphinated oils?

A. The sulphinated oils and the gilsonite mixture.

Q. 165. That you have actually used?

A. Yes.

Q. 166. Do you know of any other oils that are operative?

A. No, I do not.

Q. 167. How many different oils do you suppose you have tried and investigated in your search for an operative oil?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. I think we have in our laboratory some thousand oils.

Q. 168. Have you tried them both alone and in mixture?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 169. And these two combinations are all that you have discovered?

A. That is all.

Q. 170. Have you ever had any difficulty in getting oil in sufficient amounts for the purpose of running your plant with over 1% of oil?

A. We would be operating our slime plant now, if we were able to get oil in sufficient quantities to keep it going.

Q. 171. About how much oil would it take per day to keep it going, in rough figures?

A. It would take about 10,000 gallons a day to keep our present plant in operation.

Q. 172. How many tank cars would that be?

A. That would be one tank car. That is just for our slime plant, however.

Q. 173. For the Arthur plant?

A. For the Arthur plant alone.

Q. 174. And the Magna plant is about the same size?

A. Well, that is just for the slime treatment, and it would take about 1500 gallons per day for the re-treatment plant, and the Magna plant would take about the same amount.

Q. 175. Can you form any estimate as to the amount

Thomas A. Janney.

of oil it would take if you were to use flotation to its fullest extent in the Arthur and Magna mills?

A. It would take 87,500 gallons of oil per day.

Q. 176. And how much reserve oil is it necessary to carry?

A. We should carry at least 60 days' oil on hand, to protect ourselves against any unforeseen difficulties that might arise.

Q. 177. Was there any other occasion besides those days in July, 1915, upon which you used a large amount of oil—a comparatively large amount—previous to your present operations, I mean.

A. What do you mean by a large amount of oil?

Q. 178. Above ten pounds.

A. I believe during the months of June, July, August and September, the amount of oil we used per ton was near 13 pounds.

Q. 179. What year?

A. 1915.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 180. I thought you were not there that year.

A. I was not.

MR. GARRISON: I move that that testimony be stricken out. He was not there.

THE COURT: I think that portion of his testimony should be stricken.

Q. 181. What can you state as to the comparative occurrence of these froths with small and large amounts of oil?

A. There is practically no difference, except in the

Thomas A. Janney.

case where we used an extremely large amount of oil, such as a hundred pounds, the froth looked a little more oily.

Q. 182. What can you say as to the efficiency of the results with the same amount of oil in the laboratory operations as compared with operations in the mill?

A. Why, our mill operations have always checked, or even were better than our laboratory experiments.

Q. 183. When you increased the amount of oil to 20 pounds recently, did you make any changes in the plant or in the operation of the machinery?

A. None whatsoever.

Q. 184. You mean that you simply turned on more oil?

A. We had to prepare a means for taking a tonnage sample, but that did not change the flotation plant itself. The machines were not touched, or any of the conditions varied whatsoever.

Q. 185. Now, have you any information as to the amount of oil that goes off with the concentrates and with the tailings, do you know as to what becomes of the oil generally, when you are using these amounts above 20 pounds per ton?

A. In the retreatment of our low grade concentrate, I found that approximately 92% of the oil rejected from the plant was contained in the concentrates, and about 8% in the tailings.

Q. 186. Did you make determinations as to the amount of oil that the middlings had or returned to the head of the machine?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 187. Have you any figures or recollection as to what they carried?

A. I have. When we are operating with about 20 pounds of oil per ton I found about 60 pounds of oil per ton is in the middlings.

Q. 188. That, to the ton, the middlings carry 60 pounds of oil?

A. That is what I was trying to say, yes. In the case where we used 36.45 pounds of oil per ton for the total feed, our concentrate on that particular day, contained 111.18 pounds per ton of concentrate, and the tailings contained 8.20 pounds of oil per ton for the tailings, and the middlings contained 36.75 pounds per ton for the middlings. Of course the amount of oil in the middlings varies with the mode of operation.

Q. 189. Now, the return of that middling carrying 36 pounds of oil per ton—I will omit the fraction—has what effect on the oil supply at the head of the machine when you are attempting to supply 1% of oil to the solids being treated?

A. In this particular case where there is 36 pounds per ton of the middlings, we credit to the total oil used, 12 pounds, and that multiplied by the tonnage of middlings would be the total amount of oil that would be credited as new oil.

Q. 190. Twelve pounds, would you say?

A. Well, the middling takes 36 pounds per ton, and it would take 20 pounds of that to satisfy the mid-

Thomas A. Janney.

dling—Oh, I beg your pardon; I should have said 16 pounds.

Q. 191. You mean that 16 pounds would be credited as new oil?

A. 16 pounds would be credited as new oil, and in order to get the total amount of oil that we would credit, we would have to multiply that by the tonnage of middlings.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

X-Q. 192. That figure that you gave of 60 pounds of oil to the ton of middlings, where did you get that from?

A. That was just one particular day that I happened to pick. We had a test on March 6th where we used 20 pounds of oil per ton of the total feed, and our middlings contained 47.29 pounds. If you want to take time for me to look through my record I can pick out that day. Here is another case where we used 20 pounds, and we got 42 pounds per ton for the middlings.

X-Q. 192½. That 60 pounds was rather an exaggeration, wasn't it, or a slip?

A. No; here is a case right here—I was looking over my record last night—where we used 24 pounds, and we got 64 pounds in the middlings.

X-Q. 193. Let me look at those figures—Now the entry that you have shown me reads "Pounds of Oil in

Thomas A. Janney.

Circulation, 4434, or 64.26 pounds per ton of circulating feed." What is the basis of that determination?

A. We take tonnage samples to determine what our circulating feed amounts to, and in this particular case it amounted to 69 tons. We analyzed that and found that it contained 64.26 pounds per ton of that feed. 64.26 multiplied by 69 should give 4434.

X-Q. 194. And what was the total—then it is a calculation, isn't it, of the total amount of material flowing into that circulating feed?

A. Certainly. We could not take the whole 69 tons and determine the amount of oil in it. We would have to rely on our analysis for that.

X-Q. 195. What happened to that 64.24 pounds per ton?

A. It went down through our return plant and back to the Dorr tanks.

X-Q. 196. And then what happened to it?

A. Then went through the flotation machine.

X-Q. 197. Were you building up all the time in that flotation machine an added increment of oil from that circulating feed?

A. The way we operated our plant, we take what concentrates look clean enough, and would send that directly to the smelter or to the bins rather and the concentrate coming off the balance of the machine we considered middlings, and that constituted our circulating feed.

X-Q. 198. Well, if you were returning such an amount of oil you would be building up in your machine a great quantity of oil, wouldn't you?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Not necessarily, because about the second time the oil goes through the machine it would be going out in the form of a concentrate or with the tailings.

X-Q. 199. And this would be just something that happened at a certain minute and could not be maintained?

A. No, sir, that would become constant. The tonnage samples were taken every half hour and a composite sample ^{was} ~~were~~ taken from that sample for the twenty-four hours.

X-Q. 200. Now, what figures have you there that shows where that oil went to after it went through that machine?

A. I have no figures in this particular case. It must have gone out in the tailings or in the concentrate.

X-Q. 201. When was this experiment performed?

A. That was not an experiment; that was an actual operation.

X-Q. 202. When was it done?

A. In March, 1917.

X-Q. 203. Of what year?

A. Of 1917.

X-Q. 204. What were the oils that you were using or the mixture of oils?

A. A combination of smelter fuel oil and American creosote combined in proportion of 90 per cent smelter fuel and 10 per cent American creosote No. 2.

X-Q. 205. You might read the description of the flow sheet in the record; read it.

A. During that day seven cells, the concentrates

Thomas A. Janney.

from seven cells was sent to the bins and the products from 21 cells were in circulation. The tailings were sent to waste. Now speaking of 7 cells and 21 cells, that is the total number of cells in both of our plants. One machine has 13 cells, and the other has 15, making a total of 28 cells.

X-Q. 206. What machine was this in?

A. This is the composite result from both machines—this is treating low grade concentrate.

X-Q. 207. The same natural division between the two machines and an average of what was going on in the two machines; is that it?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 208. I ask you to read into the record the description of that days proceeding—of, if counsel will consent—the stenographer can copy it into the record and then give it back to you.

MR. WILLIAMS: We will ask the stenographer to copy both days as they appear on the sheet.

The sheet above referred to, which was used by both counsel and the witness is as follows:

Thomas A. Janney.

March 13	Tonnage.	Cu.	Fe.	Insol.
Heading	414.0	4.900	6.97	77.07
Tailing	315.0	.248		
Concentrate	99.0	19.685	25.36	17.36
Per Cent Indicated Extraction				96.15
Ratio of Concentration				4.18
Per Cent Solids in Feed				29.56
Total Tonnage New Feed			414	
Total Tonnage Circulating Feed			69	
Total Tonnage Feed Entering Machine			483	

Oils and Reagents Used

Pounds New Oil Added	7,186, or 17.36 lbs. per ton New Feed
Pounds Oil in Circulation	4,434, or 64.26 lbs. per ton Circ. Feed
Lbs. Oil Required for Circ. Tonnage	1,380, or 20.00 lbs. per ton Circ. Feed
Pounds Circ. Oil used as New Oil	3,054, or 7.37 lbs. per ton New Feed
TOTAL LBS. OIL USED AS NEW OIL	10,240, or 24.73 lbs. per ton New Feed
Pounds Calura Reagents Used	3,266, or 7.89 lbs. per ton New Feed

Oil Combinations: 90% Smelter Fuel, 10% American Creosote No. 2
Flow Sheet: 7 cells to bins; 21 cells to circulation, tailing to waste
No. 1 machine down 6'35", No. 2 machine down 5'05" due to broken
table line shaft in Retreatment Plant.

March 14	Tonnage.	Cu.	Fe.	Insol.
Heading	666.0	5.450	7.33	78.33
Tailing	519.0	.315		
Concentrate	147.0	23.585	23.42	18.82
Per Cent Indicated Extraction				95.50
Ratio of Concentration				4.53
Per Cent Solids in Feed				32.12
Total Tonnage New Feed			666	
Total Tonnage Circulating Feed			68	
Total Tonnage Feed Entering Machine			734	

Oils and Reagents Used

Pounds New Oil Added	10,467, or 15.72 lbs. per ton New Feed
Pounds Oil in Circulation	4,250, or 62.50 lbs. per ton Circ. Feed
Pounds Oil Required for Circulating Tonnage	1,360, or 20.00 lbs. per ton Circ. Feed
Pounds Circ. Oil used as New Oil	2,890, or 4.34 lbs. per ton New Feed
Pounds Calura Reagents Used	3,985, or 5.98 lbs. per ton New Feed

Oil Combinations: 90% Smelter Fuel, 10% American Creosote No. 2
Flow Sheet: 8 cells to bins, 21 cells to circulation, tailing to waste.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 209. These machines in all of these plants you have described are known as Janney machines, are they not?

A. They are.

X-Q. 210. You are the inventor of these machines, are you not?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 211. I now show you patent No. 1,167,076 to Thomas A. Janney, patented January 4, 1916, for ore concentrating apparatus, application filed August 10, 1914. You are the Thomas A. Janney to whom that patent was issued?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 212. I now show you patent No. 1,201,053 patented on October 10th, 1916, to Thomas A. Janney, for ore concentrating apparatus, application filed April 23rd, 1914. Are you the Thomas A. Janney to whom that patent was issued?

A. I am.

MR. WILLIAMS: I offer these patents in evidence.

MR. KREMER: I object to them for the reason that they are incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial for any purpose unless it is to show a picture or cut of the apparatus. The contents of the patent has nothing to do with the matter in issue. A photograph of the machine might be admissible.

MR. WILLIAMS: I would like to state the purpose.

THE COURT: What purpose, other, will that serve, Mr. Williams? What have you in mind?

MR. WILLIAMS: They serve the very important

Thomas A. Janney.

purpose of showing that all of these operations that have been described at such length by this witness and are said to represent the prior art have been carried on in a modern machine invented by Mr. Janney long after the art of flotation concentration became a part of the knowledge of the world by reason of the patent in suit.

MR. KREMER: There has been no proof that that was the cause of the result. The cause of the result, as the witness has testified, is the use of a certain oil upon a certain ore, and was not the method in which the work was carried on. I started to say, "experiment" but it was not an experiment it was an operation. It has nothing on earth to do with it.

THE COURT: That is your claim. Now they have a right to make their claim.

MR. KREMER: If they desire to introduce that as a part of their defense, we will admit it.

THE COURT: They have a right to offer it on cross examination. The objection will be overruled.

MR. KREMER: Exception.

Patents admitted in evidence and marked
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS 33 and 34.

X-Q. 213. MR. WILLIAMS: Generally, the first of these patents, #1,167,076, is for the large sized commercial machine, as you made it originally, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 214. And the second issue^d of the patent—

Thomas A. Janney.

A. That was the first patent.

X-Q. 215. No. 1,201,053 on which the application was first filed?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 216. That is your test machine, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 217. Now, generally, when did you first put at work in a practical operation, the machine of the large size shown in your first issue of patent, generally; about when?

A. I think it was in July of 1914—or I think it was in the early part of 1914.

X-Q. 218. The early part of the year 1914?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 219. And as to your other patent on which the application was first filed, when did you get that apparatus first working?

A. That was in the latter part of 1913.

X-Q. 220. Then, there is another type of machine which has been testified about, your machine with a pneumatic arrangement, compressed air going through a coarse medium in the Spitzkasten, that I take it is a later product, isn't it, later improvement?

A. I developed that machine, I think it was in the year—put it in actual operation in the latter part of 1914 in a sort of an experimental way. We put it in actual operation at the Chino Copper Company the first time, if I remember right, for large scale operations, I believe it was in June or July of 1915.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 221. That was just after the Wilmington trial, was it not?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 222. You haven't any earlier patent on machines, flotation machines, than these two that have been put in evidence, have you?

A. No, I have not.

X-Q. 223. In fact, you never invented—you haven't any other in actual issue of patents, have you?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 224. And these patents are your first inventions in flotation machines?

A. They are.

X-Q. 225. Now, in respect to the experiments in defendant's exhibit 31, series of results obtained from commercial experiments on low grade concentrates, you testified to given dates when the experiments were carried on, and you gave only one or two. I will ask you to state them in series?

A. Experiment No. 1 was made on the day shift of March 30th, 1917. No. 2 on March 29th. That ran twenty-four hours. Experiment No. 3 was on the 28th of March. No. 4 was on the 27th. No. 5 on the 26th. No. 6 was on the 25th. No. 7 was on the 28th. No. 8 was on the afternoon and night shift of March 30th. Experiment No. 9 was made on April 1st, 1917. Experiment No. 10 was made on March 31st, on the afternoon and night shift. No. 11 was run on April 2nd. No. 12 was

Thomas A. Janney.

on April 14th. No. 13 on April 3rd. No. 14 on April 6th. No. 15 on April 5th. No. 16 on April 5th—I am not sure. I will have to look it up to see whether it was on the day shift or the afternoon. And No. 17 was on the day shift of April 5th. No. 18 was on the afternoon shift of April 8th, and No. 19 was also on the afternoon shift of April 8th.

X-Q. 226. They were successive experiments—any space in between?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 227. Couldn't have been?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 228. Now, No. 20?

A. No. 20 was on April 7th.

X-Q. 229. 1917?

A. 1917, yes, sir.

X-Q. 230. How many experiments of the character of those described on April 20th, of the same general character, that is using those oils, sixty per cent smelter fuel and forty per cent Jones oil, did you carry on?

A. Why, at the Arthur plant that is all we carried on, but at the Magna plant they carried it on for several days I believe.

X-Q. 231. You have not made any showing of this experiment on the—what is it, the Magna plant?

A. Magna plant. No, just testifying to the Arthur plant results. That is all this tabulation covers.

X-Q. 232. Now, I note that on experiment 31

Thomas A. Janney.

your circulating oil is undetermined or was not given under experiments 14, 15, 16 and 17. Why is that?

A. On those days we, unfortunately, got mixed up in the samples that were taken. My instructions were not carried out and I did not know it until several days after the test was made.

X-Q. 233. Your samples got mixed so that you could not be sure of the results?

A. The boy did not take the right samples.

X-Q. 234. Now, in taking the circulating oil samples for experiments 18 and 19, how did you make your computation for those soluble constituents of the oils that had gone into solution?

A. The way we determine the amount of oil in these samples was this way: A sample was taken in the wet shape and was dried over a steam bath, and we tried not to dry off—and we tried not to drive off any of the lighter oils, and as far as our knowledge goes none of the oils were driven off by the steam bath, as the temperature couldn't very well get over 100 degrees C. A portion of the sample was then taken and placed in a flask that had previously been weighed. We added to this sample some petroleum ether and placed a stopper or cork in the flask with the stem of the reflux—that—

X-Q. 235. That is to say, an apparatus in which the material is evaporated and goes up and then condenses and goes back to where it started from?

A. Yes, sir. This flask was placed on a hot plate and allowed to boil for some time until we

Thomas A. Janney.

thought all the oil was in solution. Then we took that sample and decanted all of the filtrate off and then rewashed the sample until we were sure that all of the oil had been extracted and was filtered. We then took the filtrate and placed it under another condenser and then we drove off all of the petroleum ether by means of the heat derived from a steam bath. That is, we tried to keep our temperature under 100° C. And we continued heating at this temperature until all of the petroleum ether had been driven off. The flask was again weighed and the difference in the weights was considered the amount of oil in the sample. We went through the same routine on that same sample with benzol. We did that because we found that petroleum ether would not dissolve the coal tar oils, and then later we washed it again with alcohol in the same manner; and the sum of the residues from each determination was added together to determine the total oil.

X-Q. 236. Well, your American creosote No. 2 contained something else besides oil, didn't it?

A. Not to my knowledge. It contains naphthalene, is all, a little fraction of coal tar.

X-Q. 237. How about phenols?

A. I presume there are some phenols in it.

X-Q. 238. Isn't there usually a large proportion of phenols, a very substantial proportion of them in creosote? Can't you tell me about this creosote, what proportion of phenol ~~and what proportion of phenol~~ and what proportion of oils, insoluble?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. We do not determine them as phenols. We determine our oils as tar acids. Now, I am not chemist enough to know just what those tar acids are.

X-Q. 239. Well, give me your determination?

A. Tar acid value of the American Creosote No. 2 was 4.4 per cent.

X-Q. 240. Now, did you make any determination of the solubility or soluble parts in the proportion used?

A. No, we have not.

X-Q. 241. As a matter of fact, you know that phenol and cresol are soluble frothing agents?

A. I have heard they are.

X-Q. 242. Have you ever tried them?

A. No, sir; not in a pure state I haven't.

X-Q. 243. Don't you know whether they are or not?

A. I saw you people use them in Wilmington, in the Wilmington case.

X-Q. 244. Well, you saw us use them then?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 245. As soluble frothing agents and producing froth in that trial, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 246. Now, as to these soluble frothing agents that were present in that American creosote why, your determination does not tell us anything about that, what became of that, what proportion of that appeared in the circulating load?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. We didn't make our determination to try to find out what particular oils were returned in the middlings. We were just trying to find how much oil, regardless of the kind.

X-Q. 247. Well, these would not come within your determination of oils, would they, these substances, phenol and cresol?

A. I don't think they would evaporate with the water. I think the boiling point of phenol and cresol is a little lighter than that of water.

X-Q. 248. Well, but did you take a great bulk specimen of the water so that you would keep all the phenol and cresol that was circulating in it?

A. Yes, sir, that was taken in a bucket so we would get everything.

X-Q. 249. So you rather think the phenol and cresol in your operations were determined in weighing oils?

A. I do.

X-Q. 250. Now, in your plant how did you handle the water, did you use it over again?

A. Not the water that has been through our flotation plant, we don't.

X-Q. 251. The water that goes off with the tailings of the flotation plant, does that ever get back again?

A. Well, I presume it does. It goes out in a large field. I don't know how large it is, but it looks to me like it was a couple of miles square—and the water is returned, or a portion of it is returned.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 252. Well, then, you do use the same water over again?

A. Not at our plant. It goes to both plants. We have one central pumping station.

X-Q. 253. Well then, the water from the two plants goes to this great lake or pond and there you settle out the solids and then that is pumped back and used over again, is that right?

A. Yes, sir, but the amount of oil in proportion to the amount of water we use at both plants, I doubt very much whether you could find a trace of oil in the water.

A. X-Q. 254. That is to say there is so much water that comes from the plant that has not been through the flotation plant, is that the reason?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 255. So that even now, with these large quantities of oil, you think there would not be a trace of oil worth speaking of in the water?

A. I doubt whether a chemical analysis would detect it.

X-Q. 256. You never have made any determinations?

A. No, sir. We treat in both plants between thirty and forty thousand tons of ore a day, and for every ton of ore that goes through the plant we use one gallon per minute per ton of ore per day, so that would be 1440 gallons per ton of ore per day. 1440 times 40,000 would make quite a bit of water.

X-Q. 257. In your table, defendants' exhibit 31,

Thomas A. Janney.

you have "reagents, total pounds" in one column and "pounds per ton" in another column. What are those reagents?

A. It is an alkaline reagent.

X-Q. 258. Such as?

A. I can tell you just exactly what Dr. Ebaugh, chemist of the University of Utah says it is. It is made by boiling a mixture of lime, sulphur and caustic soda together, and Dr. Ebaugh says that—mixtures—that it forms a compound of no one definite mixture, but is composed of calcium, thiosulphate, calcium sulphide or polysulphide in solution and also sodium sulphide and the thiosulphates.

X-Q. 259. Do you use that most of the ^{time}?

A. Yes, sir, we used that entirely in the treatment of our low grade concentrates.

X-Q. 260. And that is the whole of the "other reagents"?

A. Yes, sir. At times we have used as a frothing agent a mixture of sodium sulphide and rosin.

X-Q. 261. And would that be in other reagents? Would that be in the "other reagents" column?

A. No, we didn't use that during these tests.

X-Q. 262. So that in these tests, you used these—you used this peculiar substance that was made out of—

A. Yes, sir.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

X-Q. 263. I think you want to make a little correction.

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Before recess I mentioned that Dr. Ebaugh was at the University of Utah, but I think now he is doing private consulting work in Salt Lake City.

X-Q. 264. Now, let us take experiment No. 1 on defendant's exhibit 31. The amount of the oil that was fed into the machine was 1.6 pounds to the ton of solids in the feed. Is that right?

A. 1.6 pounds of oil for every ton that went into the machine.

X-Q. 265. That is, you fed into the machine 1.6 pounds of oil for every ton of solids that was fed into the machine at the entrance end?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 266. And then this next figure, 1.39 pounds per ton, that is figured on what?

A. On the original feed, plus the circulating feed.

X-Q. 267. That would be the total amount of solids going through the machine from what point to what point?

A. From the emulsifier to the last cell.

X-Q. 268. And how many cells?

A. In one machine we have 13 and in the other one we have 15.

X-Q. 269. And how many emulsifiers?

A. Two emulsifiers at the head of each machine.

X-Q. 270. Then under the heading, "Total new and circulating oil," we have per ton of new feed, 7.91 pounds. How do you determine that?

A. That is determined by multiplying the 151 tons times 1.6; that would give you the total oil added to

Thomas A. Janney.

the machine. Then our circulating tonnage was 23 tons, and that was multiplied by the analysis—that is, the amount of oil determined by analysis, in that circulating feed, by the circulating tonnage.

X-Q. 271. How was that determined.

A. That was determined just like I mentioned before recess.

X-Q. 272. From the total material, water and solids, or liquid and solids which was moving back in that circulating feed?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 273. Now, what was the proportion of oil on the concentrates that were delivered by that plant in that experiment?

A. I haven't that figure.

X-Q. 274. Was it measured?

A. Not the oil in the concentrate, no.

X-Q. 275. Did you measure the amount of oil in the tailings?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 276. Then apparently with a feed of 1.6 pounds of oil to the ton of feed, you jumped in the plant to 6.87 pounds to the ton of solids flowing through the plant. Is that right?

A. Yes, to 6.87 pounds.

X-Q. 277. Do you regard the determination that you made of that as a reliable calculation?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 278. But you can not tell us where that oil went to afterwards?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. No, I can not.

X-Q. 279. At what time during the operation was that measurement taken?

A. That figure was calculated from a composite sample made up of samples taken every half hour during the day.

X-Q. 280. During the 8 hour run?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 281. Did you make up a composite sample before you measured—Did you measure the individuals of that composite?

A. No, sir. We had a cutter—I think it had a half inch opening in it, and we passed it across the stream, and we would take the contents collected and put them in a bucket and let them accumulate for 8 hours.

X-Q. 282. Now, I was not able to understand your description of these plants. Have you any flow sheet or drawing that would help us to understand?

A. No, I have not.

X-Q. 283. You could supply a drawing that would represent the condition of these plants, couldn't you, by way of a general diagram, so as to make your description clear?

A. If you will get permission from Mr. R. C. Gemmell, the manager, of the plant, I will be glad to do so.

X-Q. 284. But you have described it?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 285. I would like to have you describe it by a picture.

Thomas A. Janney.

A. I haven't that authority.

X-Q. 286. Are you willing to draw the picture?

A. With permission from Mr. Gemmell, I am.

X-Q. 287. Did you get his permission to describe the plant in your testimony?

A. No, but I have received instructions that I am not to give out any flow sheets of our plant. If I drew you a plan of the mill, I would be disobeying my instructions.

X-Q. 288. I don't want the mill, I want the flotation plant that you have particularly described.

A. I think I can get that authority, to draw you that.

MR. SCOTT: Do you simply want a diagram of the flotation cells and the direction in which the pulp flows and where the middlings are returned and where some of it goes to the cleaner, or what?

MR. WILLIAMS: Just a pictorial representation of each of these plants so we can have a concrete representation of the plant.

X-Q. 289. BY MR. SCOTT: Is there any objection to making a sketch of the flotation cells with arrows showing which way the pulp flows, Mr. Janney?

A. I think not.

X-Q. 290. BY MR. WILLIAMS: Well, make that sketch of both plants, and then we can understand one from the other, just of these flotation plants; of course you have no such drawing now?

A. No, I haven't.

X-Q. 291. Now, will you supply specimens of the oils that you have described?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. I will.

X-Q. 292. And also a specimen of your ore, reduced to quarter inch size?

A. I cannot give you a representative sample of our ore, because our mines cover some 720 acres of ground, and the steam shovels may be working in one part today and another part tomorrow. I can get you a sample, but I don't know that it would be representative of our ore.

X-Q. 293. Couldn't you get a sample representative of what you used in the experiment that you have described?

A. I can give you samples of our slime feed, but that is ground pretty fine.

X-Q. 294. You have those with you, haven't you?

A. I have some of that pulp with me, yes.

X-Q. 295. Well, let us have samples of your slime feed, and then try and procure from the mine a specimen as near as possible to what you used in your experiments, dry crushed to quarter inch size. Will you do that?

A. I will do that. Now, in giving you these oils, I don't know that I can give you the exact oil. When I left the plant the sample I took was taken from a tank containing some 14 or 15 thousand gallons of pine oil, and since then some oil has been put into it, and it may not be an exact duplication of the oil that I used. That holds true with respect to all other oils. I will give you what the manufacturers furnish as American creosote and Varyan pine and so on.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 296. That is to say, if the manufacturers have varied the grade since you did these experiments, you won't be responsible for it; is that the idea?

A. That is the idea.

X-Q. 297. Well, that will do for that. Now, I don't know that I quite clearly understood—When you were making your oil determinations did you de-water your sample?

A. I did not; water and oil were taken down to dryness over a steam bath.

X-Q. 298. So that it was a determination of the whole amount of the material that was flowing?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 299. Did you make any examination of the petrolic ether and the benzol that you used for the purpose of determining whether there was any non-volatile matter in that?

A. We purchased our petrolic ether and benzol from the Mine & Smelter Supply Co., of Salt Lake City, and they were purchased as chemically pure products.

X-Q. 300. After exhibit 31, on your exhibit 32 I see that there is no experiment corresponding to the last experiment on Exhibit 31. Why didn't you make that—

A. I don't quite understand you.

X-Q. 301. In exhibit 31 your last experiment was one in which you used those oils, smelter fuel and Jones oil alone, without any of the oils that you called frothing oils. In exhibit 32 there is no such experiment described; that is to say, you do not

Thomas A. Janney.

separately take your paraffine distillate and Gilsonite and see what they would do alone. Did you make that experiment?

A. I have done it in the laboratory, but not in actual practice. I was pressed for time, and I did not have time to do that. It was fair to assume that if the creosote and Yaryan pine would not do it, but the mixture together would, that the Gilsonite mixture was evidently playing a very important part.

X-Q. 302. But you have not tried it on a large scale, and you don't know what would happen on a large scale as a basis of trial?

A. No, I do not.

X-Q. 303. When you described the material which you called slime feed, you said 75% would go through a 200-mesh screen, and you did not supply any other particulars of the screen analysis. Can you do so, and if so, will you?

A. Yes, I have a screen analysis here which I think is fairly representative. This screen analysis was taken for the month of January, 1917, of our flotation heading.

X-Q. 304. Just give it.

A. .12 of 1% of this material passed through a 28-mesh screen and remained on a 35-mesh screen. .5% passed through a 35-mesh screen and remained on a 48-mesh screen. .157% passed through a 48-mesh screen and remained on a 65-mesh screen. .594 passed through a 65-mesh and remained on a 100-

Thomas A. Janney.

mesh. 8.79 passed through a 100-mesh and remained on a 150-mesh. 7.63% passed through a 150-mesh and remained on a 200-mesh. 75.46% passed through a 200-mesh screen.

X-Q. 305. Now, give me the screen analysis of the low grade concentrate which you used.

A. .05 of 1% of this material passed through a 28-mesh screen and remained on a 35-mesh. .27 of 1% passed through a 35-mesh and remained on a 48-mesh. 1.97 passed through a 48-mesh and remained on a 65-mesh. 12.09% passed through a 65-mesh and remained on a 100-mesh. 21.93 passed through a hundred mesh and remained on a 150-mesh. 27.33 passed through a 150 mesh and remained on a 200-mesh screen. 36.36% passed through a 200-mesh screen.

X-Q. 306. And these screens were of what standard?

A. They were Tyler's Standard screen, in which the ratio of openings was 1.414. You can have these screens if you want them. There is one screen there that I have not testified to.

X-Q. 307. Which one is that?

A. The concentrates.

X-Q. 308. Give the screen analysis as you have of the other material.

A. This screen analysis that I have now is the concentrate produced from our slime plant. .08 of 1% passed through a 35-mesh screen and remained

Thomas A. Janney.

on a 48-mesh. .25% passed through a 48-mesh and remained on a 65-mesh. 1.57 passed through a 65 and remained on a 100-mesh. 4.20 passed through a 100 and remained on a 150-mesh. 4.61 passed through 150-mesh and remained on a 200-mesh. 89.29% passed through a 200-mesh.

X-Q. 309. BY MR. SCOTT: Is that the concentrates from the slime flotation treatment?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 310. BY MR. WILLIAMS: What is this Gilsonite oil that you have mentioned?

A. Gilsonite itself is in a solid form. It is solid, hydro-carbon, which comes from the Uinta Valley in the northern part of Utah, I believe.

X-Q. 311. And it is the material as it is dug up out of the ground?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 312. What is its general nature?

A. It looks in appearance like asphaltum. This sample of Gilsonite that I analyzed or had analyzed, rather, was black in appearance, with a metallic lustre, very fragile. I subjected it to a distillation test and found that it contained 56.58% of oil by weight. The oil obtained from this distillation had a gravity of .8704. The color was deep red, and it becomes dark upon standing. The odor was very disagreeable; it had an odor of decomposition, with no sediment present, and very slightly viscous. The analysis showed that all the oil was distilled off at 350 degrees centigrade.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 313. What was the other material besides oil?

A. I don't know. After we distilled off all the oil, the residue looked like coke.

X-Q. 314. And it was distilled at what temperature?

A. The report shows that the maximum temperature was 350 degrees centigrade.

X-Q. 315. You would call the material tar, wouldn't you, that you had left after the distillation—the solid material that was mixed with the oil?

A. The cinder—it could not be like tar, because I said it was fragile, while tar is soft.

X-Q. 316. Was heat used in any of this work that you have described in the tables that have been put in evidence?

A. You mean the tables of the experiments?

X-Q. 317. Well, we will take first the experiments: was any heat used?

A. No.

X-Q. 318. Now, as to the operations extending over the period that you have knowledge of, was heat used at times or all the time?

A. Which table are you referring to?

X-Q. 319. Exhibit No. 30.

A. I haven't got these marked, so will you kindly read the heading?

X-Q. 320. "The Utah Copper Company, Arthur plant, February 1st, 1915, to April 8th, 1917." Now,

Thomas A. Janney.

confine the question to what was done when you were there, in 1916, was heat used at any time, and if so, at what time?

A. I was at the plant in February 1915, and previous to that time, in the latter part of 1914, we had tried heat, but it did not help.

X-Q. 321. Why are those operations given as commencing in February, 1915?

A. That is when we actually started to operate flotation at the Arthur plant.

X-Q. 322. What was done with the material which this plant received before—with the material of the grade and character that this plant received, before this flotation plant was installed?

A. We shipped it to the smelter as a low grade concentrate.

X-Q. 323. Mixing it in with a high grade concentrate, I suppose?

A. We took part of it and mixed it in with the high grade concentrates. Our smelter contract is such that we are penalized if our insoluble exceeds our iron, and the concentrates as made by our finishing table, generally contained a higher percentage of iron than insoluble, and we would mix some of this low grade with it, so that the iron and insoluble would practically balance. The balance of the low grade concentrates we usually shipped to the smelter, as our high grade charge was limited to a certain figure, and we found it would be cheaper to smelt

Thomas A. Janney.

it separately than to have all of our concentrate penalized.

X-Q. 324. As a result of the treatment that you gave this material in the flotation plant, what happened in general as to the value?

A. It increased the value of it.

X-Q. 325. Very materially, did it not?

A. Yes. We would not be doing it if it did not.

X-Q. 326. Well, as far as your knowledge goes, after having tried the result of heat before these operations were started, heat was not used during these operations, is that right?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 327. And I presume sometimes your water is pretty cold?

A. It gets very cold in the winter time.

X-Q. 328. What did you do with the slimes before you adopted flotation?

A. We treated it on vanners.

X-Q. 329. The same character of slimes that are now treated by flotation?

A. Practically the same.

X-Q. 330. What—with what sort of recoveries, we will say, as compared with flotation, and shorten it up.

A. If I remember correctly, we made somewhere in the neighborhood of 54 or 55% recovery on the vanners.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 331. And by flotation you made what?

A. Well, we are not treating the same product.

X-Q. 332. How is the product different now?

A. The product differs now inasmuch as I believe our slime now is a little finer than it used to be.

X-Q. 333. And what sort of recoveries do you make?

A. Now?

X-Q. 334. Well, I don't know whether you are operating now; but in general, what have you made with flotation?

A. After we discovered that sulphinated oil mentioned, our recoveries ranged up to 90%.

X-Q. 335. Are you using that now, that sulphinated oil, at the present time?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 336. What amount of oil are you using in that operation?

A. It is in the neighborhood of 1.4 pounds per ton.

X-Q. 337. Does your ore contain any oxidized material?

A. About 2% of our copper is in the form of an oxide.

X-Q. 338. Do you recover that?

A. I think not.

X-Q. 339. In general, what is the nature of your ore?

A. Our ore is an altered silicious porphyry with the mineral finely disseminated throughout the mass.

X-Q. 340. And a fair average of the copper content?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. The average copper content of our ore body is 1.46%.

X-Q. 341. And what are the upper and lower limits of the material that you treat—that you mine and treat and mill?

A. It varies between 1 and 1.8 per cent. There have been times when the ore has been a little higher than that, but it won't average that.

X-Q. 342. In exhibit No. 30, there are no weights of the dry product as I understand it; why is that—that is, the Utah Copper Company, Arthur ^{pa}nt, operations from February 1st, 1915, to April 8th, 1917?

A. Probably when I asked for those tabulations I had no reason for asking for the tonnage of concentrates produced. That tonnage can easily be calculated, though.

X-Q. 343. Make a calculation of that, please and be ready to give it to me later on.

A. Of the total, or for each month separately?

X-Q. 344. Each month.

MR. SCOTT: A tabulation of that, if it can be simply calculated, why should the witness be called upon to do it? It shows on the face of the table.

X-Q. 345. Can that calculation be made from the material that is given in this table without any additional material whatsoever?

A. Absolutely.

X-Q. 346. I think we would like to have your calculations because it is a necessary supplement to the information that your table gives?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. If Mr. Scott has no objection I will.

MR. SCOTT: I have no objection, if you want to be a calculator for Mr. Williams.

X-Q. 346½. MR. WILLIAMS: One other point about sulphuric acid. In any of these operations was sulphuric acid used?

A. In our slime plant.

X-Q. 347. In your slime plant?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 348. Does that show in the table?

A. Yes, sir, I think it does. Yes, it shows when it was used.

MR. WILLIAMS: I believe Judge Garrison would like to ask a question.

MR. GARRISON: With your honor's permission, I would like to clear up one matter, that is in doubt in my mind.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

BY MR. GARRISON:

X-Q. 349. Won't you take this sheet which has been admitted in evidence and marked defendant's exhibit 31—would you rather use your own—refer to the first experiment. The sheet shows that there were 151 dry tons, does it not?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 350. And it shows that you used 1.60 oil per ton?

A. Yes, sir.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 351. Which makes a total of 242 total pounds of oil used?

A. Yes, that is new oil used per ton.

X-Q. 352. No, no, answer my question just as I put it. (Read the question please.)

A. That is what I am trying to explain to you.

MR. GARRISON: Just say I am wrong if I am wrong. Just read the question please.

A. No.

MR. GARRISON: Read the question please.

(Question read as follows: "Which makes a total of 242 total pounds of oil used?")

X-Q. 353. You say you took 151 dry tons, is that correct?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 354. And to that you put in the plant 1.60 pounds of oil?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 355. That makes a total of 242, does it not?

A. It should make it.

X-Q. 356. Well, does it?

A. I haven't checked up the figures. I don't know.

X-Q. 357. All right, then, take a pencil and check it. It doesn't make it quite; it makes 241.50. I am not going to trip you on that.

A. Well, if it was 241.50 we drop the five and call it 242.

X-Q. 358. It is 241.60 as a matter of fact. I am caring nothing about that. Now, did you at any time in that day's operation add any more oil than 1.60 per ton, reckoned on 151 tons?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. At any one minute or any one hour?

X-Q. 359. Read my question please.

(Question read as follows: "Now, did you at any time in that day's operation add any more oil than 1.60 per ton, reckoned on 151 tons?")

X-Q. 359½. MR. GARRISON: Isn't that question plain?

A. I can't answer that accurately.

X-Q. 360. Why not?

A. Because I do not know the rate of flow through the machine; it might have varied from hour to hour.

X-Q. 361. I am not asking you that, sir, I am asking you in the whole eight-hour run did you ever add to that 151 tons more than 1.60 pounds of oil?

A. Not of new oil.

X-Q. 362. Then there never could be in that plant on that day by reason of anything that you did any more than 1.60 times 151, could there?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 363. How would it get in there?

A. It would come back in the form of middlings.

X-Q. 364. But, my dear man, if you only put ~~251~~⁴—

MR. KREMER: Let the witness answer the question.

MR. GARRISON: I am not quibbling with him.

MR. KREMER: We waived the formality of one counsel cross examining, without any question.

THE COURT: He is puzzled; he wants to clear it up.

MR. KREMER: Counsel should not be puzzled.

Thomas A. Janney.

MR. GARRISON: The court has said that I may continue. I have no desire to argue with him.

X-Q. 365. Now, Mr. Witness, if you never put, during that whole more than 241 pounds or 242 pounds—let's take your own figures—of oil into the plant how did any more oil than that get in the plant?

A. Why, it could stay in there and keep in circulation.

X-Q. 366. Why, certainly it could. But how could any more than 242 pounds circulate?

A. I don't think more than 242 pounds was circulating.

X-Q. 367. Precisely. Then there was never more than 242 pounds of oil in that plant during this eight hours, was there?

A. Why, sure there was, the new oil plus the amount of oil circulating.

X-Q. 368. But if you never put more than 242 pounds in that how could more than 242 pounds circulate?

A. Because we are not rejecting the 1.6 pounds of oil in the tailings.

X-Q. 369. I don't care what you are rejecting and what you are keeping. If you didn't put more than 242 pounds in oil in your tank how could any more than that circulate, by circulation, rejection or any other thing.

THE COURT: Probably the witness does not understand you.

Thomas A. Janney.

MR. GARRISON: Will you honor put it to him so he can understand it. I don't want to argue it with him.

X-Q. 370. THE COURT: You think there is other oil than this ²₄₂ pounds, as I understand it?

X-Q. 371. MR. GARRISON: You had 151 tons total of dry ore, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 372. And you applied to that 1.60 of oil, didn't you, during the whole eight hours?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 373. And you never put any more oil in than 1.60 times 151, did you?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 374. Well, then, the total amount of oil that ever got in that plant that day was 242 pounds, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 375. Now then, how was it possible then for any more oil to circulate or be in there than 242 pounds?

A. There must have been more oil in circulation when we started this test.

X-Q. 376. Well, then, this whole table is perfectly illusionary and useless, isn't it?

A. No, because I show the total amount of oil that went through the machine.

X-Q. 377. But the total amount of oil that went to the machine according to this table is 1.60 on 151 tons, isn't it?

A. No, I said there was some oil in circulation before that was put into it.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 378. Well, then, this sheet is entirely illusionary?

A. I didn't say we only used 1.60 pounds to the ton. I say we used 6.87.

X-Q. 379. Isn't the whole purpose of this table to show the amount of oil you were using per ton?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 380. Now, you said on one day when you used 151 you take your plant to make a test—

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 381. (Continuing)—and you ran your plant eight hours to make a test, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 382. And you put into your mill 151 tons, didn't you?

P. 2617, After L. 17, insert "x-Q. 383. You said you added 1.60 oil to that, didn't you? A. Yes, sir."

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 385. Now if there were other facts that you did not put down on this sheet before you began that whole experiment is illusionary, is it not?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 386. I wish you would explain that to me?

A. Our feed, as it is taken from the classifier goes to the Dorr thickener and that feed includes our circu-

P. 2617, L. 29, insert "that they are large enough so that if you would analyze" after "sure"

...see more than the total oils shown here, which is 1,195 pounds.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 387. Although you put only 242 pounds of oil in during that entire experiment, in some way or other 1,195 pounds got into that machine?

A. Well, that is probably what was in the Dorr tank.

X-Q. 388. Then the experiment is entirely illusionary so far as demonstrating anything about putting in 1.60 of oil in 151 tons of ore, isn't it?

A. There were 6.87 pounds of oil in it when it entered the machine.

MR. GARRISON: I insist on an answer to the question. Read the question.

(Question read as follows: "Then the experiment is entirely illusionary so far as demonstrating anything about putting in 1.60 of oil in 151 tons of ore, isn't it?")

A. I do not agree with you.

X-Q. 389. Well, but it is an entirely illusionary factor isn't it, that you don't know anything about?

A. I know that there is oil in circulation.

X-Q. 390. Do you know how much?

A. No, I don't. I cannot tell until after the test is completed.

X-Q. 391. Why not? Why couldn't you have told at the beginning of the test if you could have told at the end of the test or any period in the test?

MR. KREMER: Let the witness answer.

MR. GARRISON: All right.

A. I couldn't determine how much oil was in the machine until after the run was over, because as I said before our samples were taken every half hour until the test was completed.

Thomas A. Janney.

X-Q. 392. I understood you to say a while ago that you did not doubt that if you analyzed the water in circulation in your mill it would be found that it contained the percentage of oil that you put your finger on, something over six pounds to the ton, or some other figure. Is that correct or not?

A. You are talking about one thing, and I am talking about another. You are talking about our flotation plant now?

X-Q. 393. Yes.

A. And when I made that remark before we were talking ^{about} ~~out~~ our mill proper and these machines?

X-Q. 394. Are these mixed up with these exhibits you have made, or can we confine ourselves to this one sheet without mixing them up with something else?

A. If you talk about the same thing I do.

THE COURT: If there is any doubt about these things you are talking about you may ask questions that pertain to that sheet.

MR. GARRISON: Wasn't the purpose of this first experiment to demonstrate according to your operations what the result was of milling 151 dry tons with 1.60 of oil per ton added?

A. Not exactly 1.60 pounds per ton, but a small quantity of oil. And I could not determine how much oil it was going to be because I knew that there was some oil coming back in the form of middlings.

X-Q. 395. Well, now, just one moment. Do you mean some of the 1.60 coming back in the form of a middling or oil coming from some other place than the one—than the 1.60?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. We did not stop the plant to clear out the Dorr tanks before that test was made, and some oil was in that feed from the day before.

X-Q. 396. In the feed? Then this was not new feed?

A. No, the stuff that comes from the Dorr tank is new feed and middlings.

X-Q. 397. Now, when you started with your 151 dry tons was there any other feed in the plant?

A. That 151 dry tons is new feed.

X-Q. 398. Was there any other feed in the plant when you started with 151 dry tons of new feed, this particular 151 tons that you put down on this sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 399. Well, then that is illusionary here because you mixed that, what you did with this experiment with something that was left over from some other experiment? Isn't that correct?

A. That is correct.

X-Q. 400. Then this experiment—these experiments do not represent what they purport to represent, do they?

A. Yes, they do.

X-Q. 401. Well, now, can you explain that?

A. I explained that our low grade concentrate goes to the retreatment plant, mechanical retreatment plant where it is classified. The overflow from that product goes to two forty-four foot Dorr tanks—forty-four feet wide and I think they are twenty feet deep, and the cubical contents of these tanks is something enor-

Thomas A. Janney.

mous—I don't know what it is—and it contains quite a bit of feed. And as we operate from day to day these tanks or these two tanks become contaminated or contain so much oil that is carried over from the day before. Now, when I started these tests I knew that there was some oil in the feed in the Dorr tanks. I did not know how much, and I was trying to find out what result we would get by using a small quantity of oil, and that is what I did. I used 1.6 pounds of new oil and 5.48 pounds of oil that was in the tank before the test started.

X-Q. 402. You mean that was there. You don't mean that you used that?

A. That was in the tank before the test started.

X-Q. 403. So that as far as this sheet is concerned, showing what came in there, or 1.60 of oil, it is utterly useless?

A. With 1.60 pounds of oil, yes.

X-Q. 404. It is utterly useless?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 405. And it is utterly useless as to every one of the figures as to any of the quantities or amounts under 1.60?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 406. Because in each instance the amount of oil you actually were operating with was entirely different from the figure appearing in the column in which the first figure is, 1.60?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 407. And when you made an experiment there

Thomas A. Janney.

was no way of demonstrating the verity of it unless you knew what was in the Dorr tank before you began? Isn't that correct?

A. I could not tell how much oil I was going to use until afterwards.

X-Q. 408. Yes, and you could not tell about a great many other factors because of the remnants of the previous days' operations that had not been cleaned out? Isn't that true?

A. Yes.

MR. GARRISON: That is all.

MR. WILLIAMS: Subject to the reservation as to the other witness, the cross-examination of this witness is closed.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

R-Q. 409. Mr. Janney, referring to this column "pounds new oil added per ton new feed" the figures in that column, do they accurately represent the amount of new oil that was added for each ton of new feed?

A. They do.

R-Q. 410. And if there is any error in these figures and you—I won't say "error," but if these figures do not represent the amount of oil per ton of material in the apparatus are they under or over the amount per ton?

THE COURT: Is that the old oil, circulating oil?

MR. GARRISON: May we have the question read?

(Question read.)

Thomas A. Janney.

MR. GARRISON: That last question, is that an inquiry as to the new oil or old oil in the circulating feed?

MR. SCOTT: The question refers to oil generally, one of these figures are under statement or under or over the entire amount of oil including everything.

THE COURT: These figures, the figures of the new oil?

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. GARRISON: I respectfully submit there cannot be an answer to the question, the witness having testified that they accurately represent the amount of new oil. How can they be under or over something else?

MR. SCOTT: Certainly.

MR. GARRISON: I cannot see.

THE COURT: One may be certain of his figures, yet he may be able to say if he is wrong he has underestimated instead of over estimated.

MR. GARRISON: I did not understand it was an estimate. I understood he said it was the exact amount.

THE COURT: I understood it so, yet it is an estimate for the whole day as the testimony all seems to show. He may answer.

A. These figures are obtained in this way. We weigh every bit of oil, new oil, that goes into our oil feeder, by actual weight, and a record is kept of that. And then we take tonnage samples to determine the tonnage of ore treated in the plant. The total oil by weight put into the plant per day is divided by the total

Thomas A. Janney.

tons of new ore treated, which will give the pounds of oil per ton; and these figures are absolutely accurate as far as I know. I have not checked them but they should be absolutely accurate.

R-Q. 411. Now, in this computation here did you allow twenty pounds of oil per ton in the middling before crediting any of the middling oil to the new oil?

A. Not in that experiment.

R-Q. 412. Not in that experiment?

A. No, sir.

R-Q. 413. In these experiments here you could not allow the oil in the middlings without making allowance for oil that belonged to the solids?

A. It is counted as new oil when you include with the initial feed your circulating feed.

R-Q. 414. How are the figures obtained in the column under "pounds new oil added" and the sub-head "per ton total feed"?

A. The total weight of oil per day is divided by the tonnage of circulating feed plus the tonnage of initial feed or new feed.

R-Q. 415. "Circulating oil" subhead "total pounds," how is that obtained, the first number being 953?

A. Our analysis showed that we circulated 23 tons of feed that day, and that is multiplied by the analysis which gives the amount of oil per ton in the circulating feed.

R-Q. 416. Was it your intention in performing this experiment #1 to show the effect of 1.6 pounds of oil per ton or the effect of 6.87 pounds per ton?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. I was trying to get down to as small a quantity as I probably could and I did not know how much it would be.

R-Q. 417. What does it show in fact, the effect of how much oil per ton?

A. Well, it shows that we couldn't get good metallurgical results.

R-Q. 418. I know, but the result you got is the effect of how much?

A. Oil per ton of solids, 6.87.

R-Q. 419. Is there anything upon this tabulation to indicate that it is intended to show the effect of 1.6 pounds of oil per ton of ore?

A. No, sir.

R-Q. 420. As I understand your explanation these middlings are constantly coursing through the apparatus?

A. Yes, sir.

R-Q. 421. And the tonnage that you get, for instance, that 23 tons, in connection with your experiment No. 1, exhibit 31, indicates that during that period of time, whatever it was, eight hours, 23 tons of these middlings circulated through the apparatus?

A. Yes, sir.

R-Q. 422. And that each ton of the middlings so circulating carried the amount of ore stated in the table?

A. Yes, sir.

R-Q. 423. Or, isn't that stated?

A. It isn't stated in the table.

Thomas A. Janney.

THE COURT: How much is it?

A. I don't know.

THE COURT: You said you had 23 tons of middlings, and 1,195 pounds of old—1,195 pounds ore or oil, is that right or did I misunderstand you?

A. That is the total, not the circulation, 1,195; there is 953.

THE COURT: You are right.

THE WITNESS: Did I answer your question?

THE COURT: Yes, I made a mistake in the heading there.

R-Q. 424. MR. SCOTT: You gave the figures for the amount of oil on concentrates and tailings, I think, and what it was in your answer to a question?

A. I did.

R-Q. 425. Was that upon the treatment of slimes by flotation or the low grade concentrate?

A. That was the low grade concentrate.

R-Q. 426. Have you corresponding figures for the slime treatments?

A. I don't think that I have them here.

R-Q. 427. You did not make these oil assays yourself, did you?

A. No, I did not.

R-Q. 428. You are not a chemist by profession, are you?

A. No, sir.

R-Q. 429. In connection with the experiments recorded in exhibit 32, serially, the result obtained from commercial experiments in slime feed you were asked

Thomas A. Janney.

as to the effectiveness of the part of the mixture containing paraffin base distilled and gilsonite, and you answered that you had never tried that in a mill but that you had tried it in a laboratory?

A. Yes, sir.

R-Q. 430. With what results?

A. With a recovery of about 54 per cent when I used 20 pounds per ton.

R-Q. 431. 54 per cent recovery?

A. Yes. It was approximately 54 per cent, if I remember correctly.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

BY MR. GARRISON:

RX-Q. 432. Now, Mr. Janney, do I understand you from this table and the first experiment that 23 tons of circulating feed carried 953 pounds of oil?

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 433. A half ton of oil to 23 tons of metal; is that correct; pretty nearly half a ton?

A. That is what the figures indicate.

RX-Q. 434. Well, do these figures correctly indicate the fact?

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 435. Now, your experiment of the second was on the 29th of March, was it not; was it a twenty-four hour run?

A. Second experiment was on the 29th of March.

RX-Q. 436. And it was a 24-hour run?

Thomas A. Janney.

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 437. And the third experiment was the 28th of March?

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 438. And it was a 24-hour run?

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 439. And the fourth experiment was the 27th of March with a 24-hour run?

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 440. And the fifth was the 26th of March, with a 24-hour run?

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 441. And the 6th was the 25th of March with a 24-hour run. Is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

RX-Q. 442. Now, I understood you that with respect to each of these consecutive dates that I have given you, when you ran for twenty-four hours, the amount of material that was in your mill?

P. 2628, After L. 22, insert " Re-x-Q. 443. The Dorr thickener was not known to you when you began the next twenty-four run? "

RX-Q. 444. I am not talking about oil at all. I am talking about the pulp?

A. Yes.

RX-Q. 445. You did not know how much pulp it contained nor how much oil it contained? You do not know how much pulp was there?

A. No, sir.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

RX-Q. 446. And of course you did not know how much oil that pulp contained if you did not know how much pulp there was?

A. No, sir.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

RALPH AUGUSTUS CONRADS, called as a witness in behalf of the defendant, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 1. Please state your full name?

A. Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 2. And where are you at present employed? In what capacity?

A. I am employed as metallurgist, metallurgical engineer at the Magna plant of the Utah Copper Company, Garfield.

Q. 3. What experience have you had in the line of your present employment?

A. Do you wish my general experience? Is that what you refer to?

Q. 4. And education?

A. Throughout the general industry?

Q. 5. Yes.

A. I graduated from the Missouri School of Mines in mining engineering in 1904 and from the fall of

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

1904, to the fall of 1905, I was employed in the concentrator at Coppertown, Utah, of the Utah Copper Company. From the fall of 1905 until the fall of 1906, about one year, I was with the Balaklala Consolidated Copper Company on general engineering work and mine work in Shasta County, California. Following that I was for about six months with the Annie Laurie Mining Company in mine work and cyaniding. In 1907, from May until October, I was in coal mining work, in the engineering department in Mexico. From there I went to the Esperanza Mining Company in El Oro, Mexico, as mining engineer. About June, 1908, I was made assistant manager of the company, and remained in that position until February, 1911. After that I was in the same capacity—that is, assistant manager of the Dos Estrellas Mining Company at El Oro, Mexico. Following that I was director, or manager of a property in the state of Mexico, the Santa Ana Esperanza. I returned to this country in 1914, and in May, 1915, I went to work for the Utah Copper Company and have been in their employ ever since that time to the present date.

Q. 6. Is the flotation section in the Magna mill under your direction and charge?

A. It is, yes, sir.

Q. 7. What kind of material is treated by flotation there?

A. We are treating a part of the low grade concentrates.

Q. 8. Anything else?

A. No.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 9. Just the low grade concentrates?

A. Yes.

Q. 10. Is this sample similar to that at the Arthur by screen analysis?

A. It is a similar product, quite similar. The screen analysis of our flotation heading—I have here the screen analysis of February, 1917, which shows—do you want the complete screen?

Q. 11. Just approximately; I don't care about all the intermediate grades; how much goes through 150 screen, for instance?

A. There is 61.04% that will pass a 200 mesh screen. The corresponding sample for the month of January showed 62.13% passing a 200 mesh. That would be about representative, I think.

Q. 12. Have you made any investigation of flotation in the laboratory as distinguished from the actual work in the mill?

A. Well, yes, but the laboratory work at the Magna plant—we are not equipped there for extensive laboratory work, and our experiments really, while we have tried out certain things in the laboratory on a small scale—our experiments have generally been made on a large scale. When we are satisfied that a thing is worth trying out, we have tried it out on a large scale ordinarily.

Q. 13. Which is the most reliable test, or which test is the most favorable, the laboratory test or the mill test?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Why, the mill test, naturally; it gives you operating conditions and tonnage, etc., which are more indicative.

Q. 14. If a thing will not work in the laboratory does it necessarily follow that it will not work in the mill?

A. Not necessarily, it has been my experience; that is, not entirely so.

Q. 15. You have a record, I believe, of the flotation operations at the Magna plant, covering the periods from September 1st, 1914, to December 24th, 1916?

A. Yes.

Q. 16. Was this record prepared either by you or under your direction?

A. It was prepared under my direction.

Q. 17. And were the operations that are recorded there, carried out under your direction?

A. I was not at the plant during the entire time covered by this report.

Q. 18. Will you please state just the time when your connection with the plant began?

A. My connection with the Magna plant began in August, 1915.

Q. 19. And who had charge of them before that, if you know?

A. I should say—I think Mr. Tom Janney—at least I know that he had charge part of the time.

Q. 20. Mr. Janney who just testified before you?

A. Yes, sir. And I believe that probably Mr. Riser—I am not sure that he had charge of the flotation department, but he was at the plant. Mr. Tom Janney had it part of the time.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 21. Now, referring to the part of this report subsequent to August, 1915, you may state whether it is an accurate record of what took place?

A. It is an accurate record, accurately kept, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is accurate in every detail.

Q. 22. Now, have you a similar record of the operations subsequent to December 24th, 1916, kept by the months?

A. I have a summary similar to that which has been kept, beginning December 25th, 1916, up to and including April 7th, 1917.

Q. 23. And were the operations for this period under your direction?

A. They were, yes.

Q. 24. During the entire period?

A. Of course I have been absent from the plant for very short periods, but they were under my direction completely.

Q. 25. Does this document headed, "Composite Flotation Retreatment Plant Results from December 25th, 1916, to April 7th, 1917, Inclusive," correctly represent the operations of the plant during that period?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 26. Now, why were the operations up to December 24th calculated in one statement, and the latter operations in another statement?

A. Because prior to December 24th, 1916, we operated with the use of less than one per cent. of oil, and on that date or from that time forward we have operated with the use of a greater amount of oil.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 27. How did the results compare during the two periods?

MR. GARRISON: Now, if your honor please, I want to make the same objection that I made to the testimony of the other witnesses, that there is no connection between this and the prior art, and they have no right to introduce it at this stage of the proceedings.

MR. WILLIAMS: I suppose it is only necessary to suggest that we would like to have these tables to refer to while counsel is examining about them.

MR. SCOTT: Well, I did not think I would get into the middle of them, it is so near adjournment time.

THE COURT: Were you just trying to use up the time?

MR. SCOTT: No, sir, I was going on asking the questions, but I did not want to hunt up the duplicates now.

THE COURT: The objection will be overruled. If it appears later that it has not been connected up with the condition of the prior art, the objection may be renewed, but otherwise it will be in the record if some other court has to pass upon it.

MR. GARRISON: What about this objection based upon the fact that the tables have not been submitted to us?

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Scott will submit them. He says that he was—I think you call it stalling, don't you? (Laughter.)

Whereupon further hearing was adjourned until Friday, April 20th, at 10 a. m.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Friday, April 20th, 1917, 10:00 a. m.

Trial resumed pursuant to adjournment, all parties present; whereupon the following proceedings were had:

MR. SCOTT: I now offer in evidence the two tabulations which Mr. Conrads identified and verified yesterday, but before doing so I will ask a question.

Q. 28. I would like to ask how far back in point of time you are able to testify as to the accuracy of this tabulation, covering the period from September 1st, 1914, to December 24th, 1916. You testified to the date yesterday, but I don't remember whether I asked you if your knowledge covered the whole period?

A. From August, 1915, to the last date.

Q. 29. December 24th, 1916, is the last date?

A. To the end of it.

Q. 30. Have you any knowledge as to who was in charge in the period prior to August, 1915, extending back to the beginning of the report?

A. As I said yesterday, Mr. Tom Janney had charge during a part of the time prior to that, though just exactly how much of the time I could not say.

MR. SCOTT: Subject to the introduction of further proof prior to August, 1915, I offer in evidence the report entitled "Utah Copper Company, Magna plant, flotation retreatment plant results treating mineral classifier overflow and fourth and fifth spigots, September 1st, 1914, to December 24th, 1916, inclusive." I will supply the court a copy immediately.

Q. 31. As to this other report which we discussed

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

yesterday, I believe you stated that you were in charge during that entire period?

A. That is the one subsequent to the first?

Q. 32. Subsequent to December 24th, 1916?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. SCOTT: I offer in evidence the report entitled "Utah Copper Company, Magna plant, metallurgical department, composite flotation retreatment plant results for period December 25th, 1916, to April 7th, 1917, inclusive."

Papers admitted in evidence and marked Defendant's Exhibits 35 and 36.

MR. GARRISON: I desire to cross-examine before this paper is admitted.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 33. Mr. Conrads, I hand you the paper marked Defendant's Exhibit 35 and ask you what your relation was to the work that is represented on that sheet?

A. I was in charge.

Q. 34. Oh, yes, I know as to the date.

A. My relation?

Q. 35. Yes.

A. I was in charge of the entire direction of the work, the results of which are represented on this sheet.

Q. 36. You were the man who had practical charge of the work?

A. I had charge of the entire department.

Q. 37. You were the man who had practical charge of the work, by somebody else bringing you reports—not theoretical charge, but actual charge of what was done, and what was done was done by your orders?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. With this exception. I have the direction of the plant, but the operators naturally are under the mill foreman, but I direct the work. I would order any changes that were made and I watched the result.

Q. 38. You were the metallurgical engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 39. You are not the man who has charge of the plant practically, practical charge of the work?

A. I am in charge of the plant. The men, the operators themselves, are under the immediate direction and responsible to the mill foreman, but so far as the dictation of what they shall do in the plant and the operation of the plant, I dictate that.

Q. 40. In other words you lay down a policy and they carry it out?

A. The general mill foreman is directly over them, but the plant is run at my direction.

Q. 41. In other words you lay down a policy and they carry it out?

A. Yes.

Q. 42. What you know with respect to what they do is contained in reports that are furnished to you by or through the mill foreman, is not that correct?

A. I have a personal knowledge, because I spend a great deal of time right in the plant.

Q. 43. Do you go from point to point every day and put down notations yourself about what is being done?

A. I make the rounds regularly, or at various times, noting the conditions and everything pertaining to the plant in its operation.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 44. Is this sheet made up from your own original notations?

A. That sheet is made up from results which we systematically get.

Q. 45. (Question read: Is this sheet made up from your own original notations?) Answer yes or no?

A. It is not.

Q. 46. Then this sheet is made up of something written down on paper by somebody else and furnished to you? Isn't that correct?

A. This sheet is made up of tonnage measurements which are regularly and systematically taken, of the percentage of solids in the feed and the various items contained in that report are done in a regular and systematic way and under my direction.

MR. GARRISON: Read the witness the question. He has not answered it.

(Question read as follows: "Q. 47. Then this sheet is made up of something written down on paper by somebody else and furnished to you? Isn't that correct?")

MR. GARRISON: Yes, or no?

A. It is compiled from regular and systematic reports which I received.

MR. GARRISON: Read the witness the question: he has not answered it.

(Question read as follows: "Q. 48. Then this sheet is made up of something written down on paper by somebody else and furnished to you? Isn't that correct?")

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, or no?

A. I think I answered that question.

THE COURT: He has asked you if you received written statements and reports from others and you say you received reports, but you do not say whether they were written or not. You may answer it yes or no, and then qualify it.

A. Yes, I received written or typewritten statements of regular operations.

MR. GARRISON: Q. 49. And this is what this sheet is made up from?

MR. KREMER: You have a perfect right to explain it as the court told you.

THE COURT: Read the witness the answer.

(Answer read as follows: "Yes, I received written or typewritten statements of regular operations.")

MR. GARRISON: Do you want to add anything to that?

THE WITNESS: (Continuing)—which cover the operations of the department in detail as represented on this sheet and which are regularly and systematically taken and reported to me.

Q. 50. Then this sheet is compiled from reports of this character that are furnished to you; isn't that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 51. Do you yourself make any of the calculations which appear upon this exhibit, for instance "percentage of solids," do you make up the calculations which result in the figures which appear in the column headed "Percentage of Solids"?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. I personally do not make up the figures. I do, however, endeavor to check them sufficiently to satisfy myself as to their accuracy.

Q. 52. Is that true with respect to all of the other headings and the figures underneath?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 53. They are furnished originally by someone else, but you endeavor to check them sufficiently to be assured of their accuracy? Is that correct?

A. Yes, sir; to the extent that I reasonably can, considering the amount of work embraced in the department.

MR. GARRISON: I have no objection to the competency of this, subject to our usual objection as to its relevancy.

Q. 54. Now, with respect to the paper marked defendant's exhibit 36, what you have said with respect to the source of information, and the compilation under your own personal supervision as to exhibit 35 is also true with respect to 36?

A. With this exception: that on the former exhibit referred to I can only personally testify as to results of a part of that.

Q. 55. You mean as to the date?

A. As to the date. But in other respects this is exactly similar. I can testify in the same way to that.

Q. 56. And it was made up in the same way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 57. From the same sources, and your personal perception is the same?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Yes, sir.

MR. GARRISON: I have no objection to the competency of this. I object to its relevancy. I think it is plainly irrelevant.

THE COURT: You have the general objection, I suppose.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Estoppel, and all?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir. What I would say, I think this paper is competent if the evidence is relevant. He has competently proven the paper but I do not think it is relevant.

THE COURT: The objection as to estoppel, you must remember you have claims 9, 10 and 11 which certainly there would be no estoppel on by virtue of the judgment in the other suit at least, but the same ruling will be made, and of course will be all finally determined at the end of the suit, and an exception allowed.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir.

Whereupon the sheets were admitted in evidence and marked defendant's exhibits 35 and 36.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued).

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 58. Mr. Conrads, this first report from September 1, 1914, to December, 1916, has been designated exhibit 35, and I will use that for brevity, and the next one has been received in evidence as exhibit 36.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Exhibit 35 covers the period from September 1st, 1914?

Q. 59. That is it; that is 35. The other one is exhibit 36.

MR. GARRISON: Have you any copies of that?

MR. SCOTT: No, I have not. This is the only copy.

MR. WILLIAMS: I give you notice that for the purpose of cross-examination I must have an extra copy of these exhibits to hand to my experts.

MR. SCOTT: The court has an extra copy and you can use the original.

THE COURT: Be careful that no other markings are made.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Conrads, will you just tell us briefly how these figures are ascertained in the first column, in exhibit 35, "Tonnage". I mean the physical method of finding out what that tonnage is.

A. At the head of the flotation plant or flotation machines, there is a sludge tank into which the feed which is prepared for treatment is laundered, and that figure of tonnage is arrived at by weighing the entire flow for a brief space of time, getting its weight, for instance, for a period of 15 or 20 seconds, and at the same time taking a sample to determine the percentage of solids contained in the flow. By that means we are able to determine the percentage of solid material entering the machine for a definite space of time; and as that is repeated during the day at regular intervals, the tonnage for the day is compiled from that.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 60. On this table, exhibit 35, that part of it to which your knowledge extends, is any account taken of the circulating oil?

A. No.

Q. 61. Before we proceed any further, Mr. Conrads, will you make just an outline sketch that you can draw in three or four minutes, probably, of the position of these different flotation cells, with arrows, and so forth, to designate the course of the pulp and the return of the middlings, if there are any, and the position of the cleaner, if there is one, so that your testimony will be clear—nothing elaborate, but just a rough outline.

A. Just a rough sketch of the original flow, the disposition of products and the circulating feed?

Q. 62. And the cleaner, if any.

A. (Witness drawing.) I think that about represents it. The original feed which is prepared for flotation, flows into the sludge tank, which is marked here "sludge tank." The sludge tank receives in addition to this original or new feed the circulating load from the lower end of the machine; that is, the cells which are not making a finished high grade concentrate. Those overflow directly—that overflowing froth is run into the launder which I have marked circulating feed launder—

Q. 63. Tell the court what each of these circles and things represent; I don't know that he understands.

A. Oh, yes. I was getting a little ahead of my story. What I have endeavored to represent here is the gen-

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

eral plan of one full section of the flotation department, which consists of a sludge tank, a mixing box, where the oils and reagents are introduced—

Q. 64. The oil is added in the mixing box and whatever reagents you use—they are added as it comes from the sludge tank?

A. The feed from the sludge tank is drawn through a molasses gate or plug into the mixing box, where it is mixed with the new oil and in our case an alkaline reagent. From there it flows to the first emulsifying cell.

Q. 65. What is that emulsifying cell?

A. It has been described before in connection with the Janney machine. It is simply a cell which is equipped with a vertical motor, driving impellers, which run at the rate of 570 revolutions a minute under full load.

Q. 66. What effect does that have upon the pulp?

A. That is the agitating or emulsifying operation, the preparation of the feed.

Q. 67. Does it mix the oils and the reagent up with the pulp?

A. Yes. Now I have indicated here the three emulsifiers, which are in series. The feed goes into the first, and leaving that it goes into the second and the third. From the third it goes into the first treatment cell, of which there are 16 in the section. I don't know just how many I have represented, but that is immaterial I guess.

Q. 68. You have represented about 12?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Well, I have marked "and so forth."

Q. 69. Well, I see you have eleven, so the and so forth means five?

A. All right. Well, to go ahead with the flow, after passing the emulsifiers the feed flows into the first cell from which it overflows into spitzkastens on the side, these being double spitzkasten there is a spitzkasten on either side.

Q. 70. What is a spitzkasten? And what is its purpose?

A. The spitzkasten is a pointed box.

Q. 71. Pointed at the bottom?

A. A "V" shaped box into which the pulp from the cell proper, where it is agitated, overflows. There the froth flows off of the top and falls into a launder.

Q. 72. What is the purpose of flowing the pulp into the spitzkasten, to gather the froth?

A. It is a quiescent state.

Q. 73. The pulp is quiet here and that permits the froth to rise?

A. Yes. Here it is subjected to a very violent agitation, and overflowing from that cell it goes out into the spitzkasten, where it is relatively quiet.

Q. 74. Under flowing from one to the other?

A. Well, it overflows in this case. The pulp from the cell into the spitzkasten is introduced under a baffle, which submerges it about two and a half inches under the level of the pulp, and the spitzkasten—now, I have indicated here three cells as going to high grade, which is a variable quantity. In the case of extreme

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

heavy mineral load it is more, and in the case of a lighter load it is less. In other words, we simply cut in more cells to high grade and less to low grade as the conditions warrant.

Q. 75. You mean that the product from these three or four cells is taken off separately from that of the latter cells?

A. Yes; these first cells make a finished concentrate which is high grade and ready for shipment when settled, without any further concentration.

Q. 76. How about the lower cells?

A. The lower cells are not; they are lower grade; containing more silica and having a lower grade concentrate which is not sufficiently concentrated or clean enough to be considered finished or ready for shipment.

Q. 77. What is done with the concentrate from these lower cells?

A. From these lower cells that concentrate is returned to the sludge tank and reintroduced, along with a regular feed.

Q. 78. That is your circulating load?

A. That is our circulating load? I have indicated on this sketch only three cells going to high grade, and the balance being returned to circulating load; however, that is a variable condition; we can cut in four or five or six or all, if necessary.

Q. 79. Just make a note there that there are 16 cells there; three emulsifiers and sixteen cells?

A. Yes, I will make that.

Q. 80. Is there any thickening in this sludge tank, or is it simply a receiving tank?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. That is a receiving tank.

Q. 81. No Dorr thickener makes a part of this plan?

A. No. We have a Dorr thickener, but it is ahead of this. The sludge tank receives the thickened pulp. I have only represented this from the point after the thickened feed goes into the plant.

Q. 82. After the thickened material goes into the sludge tank it never goes to the Dorr thickener again?

A. No, sir, not after it comes in here.

Q. 83. This is the final tailings, which comes out at the end of those 16 cells?

A. The final tailing from here is the final tailing of the mill.

Q. 84. These cells are in series; what leaves one goes into the next and so on.

A. A straight series from start to finish. Every bit of feed that enters this first emulsifier, or every bit of feed into the section enters the first emulsifier and flows in series to the second emulsifier and to the third emulsifier, and in series right through the machines.

Q. 85. Part of the froth being taken off as it goes on through?

A. Yes, exactly, either to high grade or to circulating load.

MR. SCOTT: I offer the illustrated sketch made by the witness in evidence.

Sketch admitted in evidence without objection and marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 37.

THE WITNESS: I did not indicate on there anything about the tailing or the waste product, I have only indicated the concentrates.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 86. Well, you can put an arrow showing where the tailing goes; that will be sufficient, I guess.

A. All right, I will do that. (Witness drawing).

Q. 87. In this table, exhibit 35, in evidence, is any record made or account taken of the circulating load or the oil in the circulating load?

A. In exhibit 35?

Q. 88. In exhibit 35.

A. There is not.

Q. 89. Does this sketch, which you have just made, exhibit 37, represent one of the several sets of apparatus?

A. One of two at the Magna plant.

Q. 90. And that comprises the Magna plant, those two sets of apparatus similar to what is shown on exhibit 37?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 91. Just state the extreme limits, the range of the amount of oil shown on exhibit 35.

A. The extreme range as indicated there—

Q. 92. (Interrupting) Per ton, I mean.

A. Yes. The lowest amount of oil used in that period was an average for the month of March, 1915, which was 1.23 pounds of oil per ton.

Q. 93. And the highest was?

A. The highest was 5.37, which was the month of April, 1916.

Q. 94. Does the record in evidence as exhibit 36, take into account the circulating load, both of solids and oil?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Yes.

Q. 95. About the center of the sheet there is a column entitled "Pounds, New Oil Added." Now just tell us what the figures in that column represent.

A. The figures in that column headed, "Pounds of New Oil Added" is the actual weight in pounds of new oil, that is not considering oil from circulation.

Q. 96. That is the oil consumption rather?

A. Yes, that indicates or represents the new oil consumed.

Q. 97. Now, referring to the column entitled "Pounds of Oil in Circulation," please state what the figures in that column represent and how they are determined.

A. Pounds of Oil in Circulation?

Q. 98. Yes.

A. That represents the total amount of oil in that circulating load.

Q. 99. The figures being for the month—this being monthly statement?

A. Yes, that is for the month.

Q. 100. Now, will you tell me how these figures are determined? I don't want the assay method, but I want the way of getting the samples, etc.

A. The return feed or circulating load is regularly sampled as it enters the sludge tank and the amount of oil is determined in that feed, from samples, in pounds per ton of wet feed is the way that we originally determined it.

Q. 101. Pounds per ton of wet feed?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Of wet circulating load. At the same time we get another sample which is dried in order to determine the per cent of solids in the feed or in that circulating load. From these we can calculate the various things that we want for this sheet.

Q. 102. The next column is entitled, "Excess pounds of Circulating Oil." Now I wish you would explain the meaning of that heading and what the figures represent.

A. The excess pounds of circulating oil is the amount of oil left after satisfying the dry tonnage in the circulating load with 20 pounds of oil per ton.

Q. 103. You name 20 pounds because you were aiming to supply—

A. (Interrupting.) We were aiming at 20. I was going to modify that in this way: There have been times that I ran some tests which will probably be referred to, in which we used varying amounts, and at that time, that dry tonnage in the circulating load was satisfied with its amount, that is, the amount that we were aiming at during that test.

Q. 104. So the word "excess" mean excess over and above the amount of oil per ton of solids you are attempting to supply to the machine?

A. Exactly.

Q. 105. And if that amount you are trying to get is 20 pounds, why, the excess is the excess over and above 20 pounds?

A. Yes. We calculate the total amount of oil in that circulating load. We calculate the total dry ton-

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

nage in the circulating load. Then we deduct from that total amount of oil sufficient oil to satisfy that dry tonnage which is entering the head of the machine in the circulating load and credit the excess oil as a balance.

Q. 106. What is the object of determining that oil in the circulating load, in determining its excess over the predetermined amount you are attempting to supply.

A. In order to ascertain the total amount of oil entering the machine.

Q. 107. And what relation does it have to the amount of new oil you have?

A. Well it simply augments.

Q. 108. Simply what?

A. It just augments the amount. If we have, for instance, 15 pounds of new oil per ton going into the machine, and we have 10 pounds, for example, of excess oil from circulation, it shows a rate of 25 pounds of oil entering the head of the machine per ton of dry feed entering it. Does that answer the question?

Q. 109. I think so. The column entitled "Pounds of Oil in Circulation" contains figures which are obtained how?

A. "Pounds of Oil in Circulation"?

Q. 110. Yes. That is the one we just had.

A. That is the one we explained.

Q. 111. Yes, I made a mistake. The column I meant was, "Total Pounds of Oil, New, Plus Excess."

A. "Total Pounds of Oil, New, Plus Excess" is the

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

figure 1 referred to just a minute ago. That is, the pounds of new oil per ton of original feed plus the pounds of circulating—excess circulating oil per ton of original feed.

Q. 112. Take the second entry there for the month of January, that is obtained simply by adding 528,760 in the "Pounds of New Oil" column and the 103,358 in the "Excess Pounds" column, gives us 632,118 pounds?

A. Correct.

Q. 113. Now the pounds of new oil per ton is simply a matter of calculation from the preceding column?

A. The pounds of new oil per ton?

Q. 114. Yes, that column is simply—

A. (Interrupting.) That is simply the total amount of oil divided by the total tonnage of new feed.

Q. 115. The column "Pounds of Circulating Oil Per Ton" of new feed is figured on the entire tonnage, including new feed and the circulating load?

A. The pounds of circulating oil per ton—yes, that is the total circulating oil divided by the tonnage.

Q. 116. Now, taking this column "Total Pounds of Oil Per Ton, New, Plus Excess," the figures in which two columns are added to obtain the figures in that column?

A. The figures in the column "Total Pounds Oil Per Ton, New, Plus Excess"?

Q. 117. Yes.

A. That is the sum of the "Pounds of New Oil Per Ton" and the "Pounds of Excess Circulating Oil Per Ton".

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 118. In the case of the month of January the sum of 18.41 and 3.60?

A. Right.

Q. 119. Now, I notice that in the month of January, which is the second entry, you take credit for 3.6 pounds per ton of excess circulating oil?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 120. Have you any explanation as to how that amount of circulating oil builds up in the apparatus?

A. How the circulating load or the amount of oil in circulation builds up?

Q. 121. Yes, how it builds up to that extent.

A. Well, that is a condition which arises in various places, in metallurgical plants. Now, for instance, we introduce a certain amount of oil, of new oil, into the head of the machine. There is a part of that oil which is discharged with the concentrate and is lost to circu-

P. 2653, L. 20, insert "from these return cells which to make up the circulating load contains a certain amount of oil, the froth" after "froth"

into the head of the machine, it meets the new oil, and that process is repeated, some of the oil being lost in the concentrate. That is lost from the machine, and as you go down, the machine, the return cells continually throw over oil which is returned into circulation.

Q. 122. Referring to these lower cells of the series from which the froth is returned as a middling to the sludge tank, does that froth carry with it more or less water when it goes back?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 123. And what is its condition as to its capability of flowing in a launder?

A. Well, it is sufficiently thin to flow.

Q. 124. Thin enough to flow?

A. Thin enough to flow, yes.

Q. 125. And the oil that is carried back with these middlings, where is it; in the water or in the concentrate or both or what?

A. Well, that—to say exactly where that is, I can not tell you just in what proportions that would be represented in the water or in the mineral, or exactly what the various proportions of that oil is, but it is certainly safe to say that a great deal of it is carried right in the water, in the general water.

Q. 126. Your determination simply is a determination of the total amount of oil regardless of whether it is sticking to the solids that are in the water, or whether it is emulsified in the water; is that the idea?

A. Our determination is simply the amount of oil in that feed, regardless of what it is or what condition it is in.

Q. 127. Now, during these months from December to April, recorded on exhibit 36, I note you have used quantities of oil for January, February and March in excess of 20 pounds; I would like you to compare the metallurgical results obtained during these months with the metallurgical results shown on exhibit 35 covering the period when smaller amounts of oil were used.

A. Well, one of the most noticeable things, or first

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

to be noted is the comparison in the per cent of copper in the tailing. Now, in exhibit 35 we have an average of .290 as a per cent of copper in the tailing. That is, that represents a loss. Now, on exhibit No. 36 we have in the corresponding figure, .157.

Q. 128. Well, I am talking now, the average for the five months.

A. Yes.

Q. 129. Now, will you make the same comparison individually with January, February and March, during which months the amount of oil was above twenty pounds?

A. Well, we have in January—we used an average of 22.01 pounds of oil per ton, and our average tailing for the month was .106 per cent copper. For February we used an average of 23.21 pounds of oil per ton and made a tailing containing .121 per cent of copper. For March we used 20.62 pounds of oil per ton and made a tailing of—that figure is blurred a little bit; it looks like .161.

Q. 130. It is .181 here?

A. .181 that figure is. It is a little blurred on this copy. Now for the month of April, which will naturally attract anyone's attention, the tailing there is .402.

Q. 131. Isn't it .401?

A. .401, yes. But that is due to another cause.

Q. 132. What was the cause?

A. Well, during that time I made some tests or rather, complete day runs in a reduced amount of oil. You will see that the average for those first seven days was 16.08.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 133. This table does not show anything about the seven days. You know that cannot cover the whole month?

A. No.

Q. 134. How many days does it cover in April?

A. The days on which we used the low amounts?

Q. 135. Yes.

A. The first and second.

Q. 136. Well, this average result for April, which part of April do they cover?

A. From the first to the seventh inclusive.

Q. 137. Now, will you make the same comparison as to the indicated extraction under the conditions represented upon exhibits 35 and 36?

A. Referring to exhibit 35 the percentages of indicated extraction—the average for the entire period was 97.461 per cent, and for the subsequent period covered by exhibit No. 36 the indicated extraction for the entire period was 98.161.

Q. 138. How about the individual months during that period represented by exhibit 36?

A. Well, the individual months, with the exception of the seven days in April and for which I suggested an explanation as to the cause of that low extraction—with that exception the indicated extraction is above 98 per cent, in fact very close to 99 per cent in two cases.

Q. 139. How about the month of March?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. That is, above 98 in three cases, and in the month of March 97.887, which is practically 98 per cent.

Q. 140. How does the grade of the concentrate compare in value during the periods represented by exhibits 35 and 36?

A. Well, for exhibit 35 the average of the concentrate produced was 30.294 per cent copper, and for the subsequent period covered by exhibit 36, the average is 28.458.

Q. 141. That is, taking into the average the April results?

A. Taking into the average the April result, yes, 24.731.

Q. 142. And while you are stating that, just state the copper contents for December, January, February and March of the concentrate?"

A. The copper content of the concentrate for December was 33.218; for January 29.414; for February 29.337; for March 27.369.

Q. 143. Does any factor enter into the value of these copper concentrates other than the amount of copper, the proportion of copper?

A. Yes, the percentage of silica or insoluble is one factor.

Q. 144. State what that has to do with it, the percentage of silica.

A. The percentage of silica is a disadvantage, in that it represents so much material which carries no

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

value—that is, metallic or mineral value. The freight transportation has to be paid on that.

Q. 145. Does it have anything to do with the smelting?

A. And also in smelting if there is an excess of silica over iron the smelting of that has to be paid for specially.

Q. 146. If the silica and iron balance each other, it leads to no additional smelting charge?

A. It leads to no additional smelting charge. There is an additional charge when the silica exceeds the iron content.

Q. 147. How do these concentrates, during the period represented by exhibit 35, compare with those for the period represented by exhibit 36 in the matter of the relation of the amount of silica and iron?

A. For the period covered by exhibit 35 we have an average percentage of 21.013 per cent iron and 16.116 per cent insoluble. For the period represented by exhibit 36 we have 21.196 per cent iron and 17.359 per cent insoluble.

Q. 148. Do you regard the difference between these figures as substantial or not?

A. In the view of other results it is not. Now there is an excess—I haven't figured it exactly, but there is about five per cent excess of iron on exhibit 35 and in round numbers four per cent on exhibit 36; in both cases the iron exceeds the silica.

Q. 149. That is the principal thing, is it?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. That is the principle thing—that is, not the principle thing, no; in that connection it is the principle thing, but the principle thing really is the difference in the extraction, as represented by the very much lower tailing during the last four months, or since December 25th.

Q. 150. In our operations do you encounter any other instance of a circulating load, other than the circulating load we have discussed in connection with this flotation operation?

A. In general you mean?

Q. 151. Yes, in general metallurgical operations?

A. Why, yes; that matter of circulating load, we find that frequently in one connection or another. There is a very simple one, for instance, in a crushing plant. Take, for example, a plant which is, we will say, crushing a hundred tons a day, now that feed, we will say is crushed in rolls for example. After passing the rolls it is screened. The under size is passed on for further treatment, while the over size or the part that is not reduced fine enough to pass the screen, is returned to the rolls for regrinding. Now, we have that steady constant rate of 100 tons per day of new material. That circulating load, due to this returned over size, may build that load up so that you are crushing—the work that the rolls are actually doing will be four or five hundred tons, or perhaps more than that, per day. Now, I think that is comparable, in that we will say you have a hundred pounds of new

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

oil going into your flotation machine; you have a certain amount that is lost in circulation by going out with the concentrate, we will say; that would compare to the under size from that screen, which is lost to the circulation through the rolls. Then we have the oil which is contained in the middling, or circulating load, which is returned; that would be comparable to the over size which is returned to go through the rolls again. So that at any one minute we would have much more than the indicated rate of new feed as a load for the rolls.

Q. 152. Now, referring again to exhibit 36, we have a column "pounds of new oil per ton." That includes the entire tonnage, the new feed as well as the circulating solids, does it?

A. No.

Q. 153. It does not?

A. No, it does not.

Q. 154. It is pounds of new oil per ton of new feed?

A. Yes. The dry tonnage in the circulation is taken care of by itself in our calculations. We satisfy it with its proper amount of oil before we make any credit for the excess circulation.

Q. 155. What was the material that was being treated during this time recorded in exhibit 35; it is described as being mineral, "classifier overflow, and fourth and fifth spigots" in the title of the record. Can you tell us what that is?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. The material which we treat by flotation is a part of the low grade concentrate made in the mill. Now, in saying a part, I will explain that that part is gotten in this way: the entire product of the low grade concentrate is classified in the hydraulic classifiers of five compartments each. Now the coarsest material which comes down in the first spigot, along with the next coarsest in size in the second, and the succeeding in the third compartment—the products from those three spigots are treated on Wilfley tables. The product from the fourth spigot and the fifth spigot, along with the overflow from that classifier, is pumped to thickeners; we use both the cone tanks and the Dorr thickener for thickening this product. Then the under flow, or the thickened product from both the cone tanks and the Dorr tank is laundered to the flotation plant for treatment.

Q. 156. Have you any figures regarding its fineness?

A. Yes. Well, yesterday I gave the screen analysis of the flotation heading for February as 61.04 per cent passing through a 200 mesh.

Q. 157. Well, never mind; I had forgotten that you gave that.

A. It is quite a fine product.

Q. 158. Was the same material being treated during the period recorded in exhibit 36?

A. Yes.

Q. 159. Generally, was the material of the same character during the periods represented by 35 and 36?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Yes. Now, in going over the old records, I will say that there is just a little difference, which does not amount to anything, and that is, that there was a period of experimentation, when they used some of the third spigot product, but that is only a relative matter; but the product is essentially the same product.

Q. 160. What is the most important element in the operations of your plant, if you can state it in that way, recovery or the grade of the concentrate?

A. Why, recovery is the most important.

Q. 161. Now I believe you have made some tests designed to show comparative results with different amounts of oil, have you not?

A. Yes.

Q. 162. Have you a record of those tests?

A. I have, yes. You refer to the statement marked "statement showing loss in pounds of copper and consequently monetary losses due to abnormal tailing caused by variation in the amount of oil—"

Q. 153. Yes, I believe that is it. The title is "Utah Copper Company, Magna plant, statement showing loss in pounds of copper and consequent monetary loss due to abnormal tailing caused by variation in amounts of oil used per ton of ore treated, December 25th, 1916, to March 24th, 1917, and abnormal test March 25th to April 2nd, 1917." I will ask you if these operations recorded upon this paper were carried out by you?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Yes, sir, under my direction.

Q. 164. And you can state that the results here recorded are correct?

A. To the best of my knowledge and belief I think they are accurate in every detail.

MR. SCOTT: I offer this report in evidence.

Report marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT
38 and admitted in evidence.

MR. GARRISON: I would like to cross examine as to this.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 165. These were experiments were they?

A. Well, if you want to classify them as experiments—we were trying out that condition; if that is what you mean by an experiment—but we did it on full scale operations.

Q. 166. But I mean it was not the ordinary operation in your mill; it was done for the purpose of ascertaining the effect of running your mill under certain conditions?

A. It was a variation in the amount of oil per ton of the ore treated by flotation, but applied to our regular heading and the entire amount of feed under treatment.

Q. 167. (Last question read.) You can answer that yes or no, can't you?

A. I don't believe that that can be answered directly without a certain qualification.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 168. Why not?

A. Because we are continually varying our conditions; that is, we may be at any time varying our conditions as to the amount and kind of oils, reagents, and such variable things, and we do that in our regular operations.

Q. 169. Those were different conditions, weren't they?

A. We vary our condition from one time to another.

Q. 170. And those variations or different conditions—they were different conditions, weren't they, different one from the other?

A. Yes; we differ one from another in our regular operations—one day from another.

Q. 171. I haven't asked you that. I say when you do make these variations they are with respect to each other different conditions, aren't they?

A. They are different conditions, yes.

Q. 172. Then I will ask you whether or not these things shown on here which are different from the normal and which are designated as abnormal were done for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of the abnormal conditions which are different from the normal conditions; isn't that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 173. And they were all done by you or under your direction?

A. They were all done under my direction.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 174. And you are satisfied that you can testify as the verity of the figures?

A. Positively, yes, sir.

Q. 175. And as representing truthfully the conditions that existed in the mill at the time that these figures show the record?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. GARRISON: We have no objection as to the competency.

THE COURT: The result of what we might call the permanent objection is permanently overruled at the present time.

The document admitted in evidence and marked Defendant's exhibit 38.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued),

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 176. What was the general purpose of these operations represented by exhibit 38?

A. The general purpose of these operations was to determine and note the effect produced by the reduction in the amount of oil per ton of ore treated without any variation in the oil combination itself, in its proportion; simply in the amount of that combination being used per ton of feed.

Q. 177. In reducing the amount progressively, as I have—as I see you have done, did you adhere rigidly to the conditions prevailing when you used

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

the maximum, 22.18 pounds; or did you adapt, as best you could, the conditions to the varying and smaller amounts?

A. Well the conditions—We ran that under two general conditions. We would run, for instance on the 25th and 26th of March, we ran on those two days under the normal conditions of carrying the circulating load and we included, or include the amount of oil in excess of 15 pounds per ton of pulp in the circulating load.

Q. 178. You did that because it was your effort to arrive, as nearly as possible, at 15 pounds per ton?

A. 15 pounds is the amount that we endeavored to maintain, 15 pounds per ton of feed during those two days.

Q. 179. And on March 25th and 26th, the amount, I note, taking into accounts credit for the circulating oil were, 16.17 and 15.84. That is correct is it not?

A. Yes. Now, for March 27th and 28th we eliminated the circulating load.

Q. 180. So that 16.23 for March 27th and 16.41 for March 28th represents the amount of new oil relative to the new feed, the circulating feed being ignored entirely?

A. Yes, the new feed was the total feed on those days because there was no circulating load.

Q. 181. You cut the circulating load out?

A. Entirely, every cell.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 182. The pulp flowed straight through the machine from end to end without any circulating load at all?

A. Yes. What froth was discharged from each and every cell went directly to the high grade concentrate.

Q. 183. Then, as I understand your last answer, upon these days when you did not take credit for circulating oil, you didn't have any circulation; you eliminated the circulation entirely?

A. Didn't have any; there positively was no circulation at all; no circulating load.

Q. 184. It was not a question of not taking into consideration something that was present, but you simply cut the circulating load out of the system altogether?

A. We absolutely did not have a circulating load.

Q. 185. The first entry is designated "Normal" and the amount of oil is 22.18 pounds. What is the meaning of the word "normal" in that connection?

A. We assume or assumed the average condition as obtained—or average results as obtained from December 25th to March 24th inclusive as the normal condition of operation under the large amount of oil or the increased amount of oil from our prior practice.

Q. 186. Normal, as representing your present mode of operation with over one per cent of oil?

A. Yes. In other words we began the use of the

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

large amount of oil on the 25th of December, and at the time that these tests were begun, on the 25th of March, we simply took our average results for the entire period up to that time, and assumed that as the normal figure, as the basis of comparison.

Q. 187. Oh, yes. That entry "normal" you say covers the period from December 25th, as stated, 1916, to March 24, 1917?

A. That is just before these tests were begun.

Q. 188. Now, what was the result of these tests with regard to the efficiency of using less of this mixture than 22.18 pounds which you took as the normal average?

A. Well, we found we got vastly better results with the greater amount than we did with the reduced amount. Now, this statement carries that out for the purpose of comparing the difference in operation, that is, the percentage of copper in the tailings, also the actual loss in operating under the different conditions. And then we go ahead and figure what that loss means in money at the assay of the tailing, that is, the actual amount lost on the actual tonnage of tailing which was discharged from the plant during the test; and that loss is figured at 15 and 20 and 25 and 30 cents per lb. in order to determine the monetary loss.

Q. 189. So that we are sure that we have it right, and instead of having it in this table, suppose you run right down that first column of dates, and the

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

amount of oil and just state briefly what the amounts of oil was in each of these runs and how it was computed and whether the machine was circulated—operated with circulation or not.

A. The first figure under the column "Average Pounds Oil Used per Ton of Ore Treated" is 22.18, and that represents the average pounds of oil per ton during the entire period from December 25th 1916, to March 24, 1917, inclusive. Now, on March 25th it was endeavored to maintain an average of 15 pounds of oil per ton including the excess oil from the circulating load. On March 26th the same condition obtained. On March 27th and 28th it was endeavored to use 15 pounds of oil per ton, that being only new oil, though. There was no oil credited from circulation and positively no circulation, as the discharge from every cell was direct into the high grade launder and nothing whatever was returned to circulation. On March 29th there were no tests made. On March 30th it was endeavored to use 10 pounds of oil per ton of feed without circulation, the same condition obtaining as did on March 27th and 28th. All froth was discharged to concentrate launder. On March 31 it was attempted to maintain the oil at 10 pounds per ton including excess oil from circulation, and the excess in this case being after the dry tonnage in circulation was satisfied, with 10 pounds of oil per ton. On April 1st it was attempted to maintain the oil at 5 pounds per ton of feed without circulation.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

And on April 2nd it was attempted to maintain the oil at 5 pounds per ton inclusive of the circulation, inclusive of the excess oil from circulation; and in this case, excess oil is the amount of oil in excess of 5 pounds per ton of dry pulp in circulation.

Q. 190. Now, referring to the column, "Average per cent. Copper in Tailings" does there seem to be a fixed relation between the efficiency of operations when you figure the oil with and without circulation, or whether you operate with and without circulation and figure the oil accordingly?

A. Well, on March 25th the average per cent. copper in tailings was .241, and on March 26th it was .278.

Q. 191. That is, with circulation?

A. That was with circulation.

Q. 192. At 15 pounds?

A. Yes, approximately, or we endeavored to hold it at 15 pounds. Now, without circulation, on March 27 and March 28 we have .249 and .300 respectively.

Q. 193. What is the difference between these figures such as, to one of your experience would be regarded as involving a substantial difference or as being substantially identical?

A. I cannot see that there is any substantial difference, anything specially noteworthy.

Q. 194. Now, taking March 30th and 31st with the effort—when the effort was to use 10 pounds, and which shows about 10 pounds were used, how do the tailings compare with circulation and without?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. On March 30th we used 10.63 pounds of oil per ton without circulation and made a tailing of .589% copper, and on March 31 the total oil inclusive of excess oil from circulation averaged 10.33 pounds per ton in the feed and the average copper in the tailings was .486, which is a little lower than that made without circulation.

Q. 195. About one-tenth of a per cent?

A. Yes.

Q. 196. Now, with your operation, attempting to fix the oil at 5 pounds with and without circulation, will you compare the copper in the tailings?

A. On April 1st we ran, without circulation, used a total of 5.16 pounds of oil per ton of feed and made an average tailing of .560% copper; on the 2nd of April we used a total of 4.16 pounds of oil per ton treated, which figure includes excess oil from circulation after crediting the dry pulp in circulation with 5 pounds of oil per ton, and an average tailing made that day was 1.277%.

Q. 197. Do you know any facts to explain that rather high tailing with circulation at 5 pounds as compared with the lower tailing without?

A. Why, yes, there is an explanation I think, that will apply there—it certainly does apply, and that is that there was on that day not enough oil to satisfy the mineral in the pulp. There was no oil accumulated from that circulating load. There was not enough oil there to satisfy the mineral. We

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

had a great deal of difficulty that day. While we aimed at 5 pounds of oil per ton we only got ~~1.16~~^{to} 4.16. There was simply not enough oil in the system, in the machine.

Q. 198. Now, what was the general trend of results to the copper loss in tailings as the amount of oil is decreased, in these series of experiments?

A. The tailing went quite constantly upward as the amount of oil per ton was reduced. In fact it went to the point that it represented a great big loss, an enormous loss.

Q. 199. What is the range of figures, just to get them plainly stated outside of this table—loss in tailing?

A. The loss in tailing for that period which we considered a normal period, from December 25th, 1916, to March 24, 1917, the average loss in pounds of copper per ton of tailings, was 2.40 pounds of copper per ton. On March 25th it was 4.82.

Q. 200. With 16 pounds of oil; is that what you mean?

A. Yes, with 16 pounds of oil.

Q. 201. Might as well state the amount so we know what the figure is related to.

A. On March 26th it was 5.56 with 15.84 pounds of oil used. On March 27th it was 4.98 with 16.33 pounds of oil. On March 28th it was 6.00 pounds of copper per ton with 16.41 pounds of oil per ton. On March 30th it was 11.78 pounds of copper per

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

ton with 10.63 pounds of oil used per ton. On March 31 it was 9.72 pounds of copper per ton with 10.33 pounds of oil per ton used. On April 1st it was 11.20 pounds of copper per ton with 5.16 pounds of oil used per ton, and on April 2nd, it was 25.54 pounds of copper per ton with 4.16 pounds of oil used per ton.

Q. 202. Does that last figure you read, a loss of 25.54 pounds of copper to the ton, represent any recovery at all? What were the headings here, about?—Unless the other side wants it I don't care about the actual figures but I should like to know what kind of material you were treating.

A. Yes. I can give you the actual figures. That was April 2nd.

Q. 203. April 2nd. The test marked "C" with a star.

A. On April 2nd the heading contained 7.14% copper. The tailing as shown on this exhibit 38 was 1.277% copper, and the concentrate 27.09% copper. The indicated extraction for that day was only 86.16%.

Q. 204. Now, do your notes enable you to give the same figures for that normal period or does that already appear in some of the tables we have in evidence?

A. Well, for that normal period—I haven't that figure for the normal period with me, I believe, right now. I can give you though—I can give it to you by months.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

Q. 205. Maybe you can compile it before you come back after recess and then you can give it to us for that whole period just for a basis of comparison. Now, I find a column here "Loss, Pounds of Copper per Ton." That is the column we have been talking about. The next column is, I take it, the loss per ton on 15 cent copper—That is what it says, the value I presume of the copper that is lost in each ton of ore treated.

A. Yes, this first set of figures, the loss per ton at 15, 20, 25 and 30 is the calculated total loss.

Q. 206. The value of the copper that goes into the tailings?

A. Yes, without any comparative—without any comparison being attempted. That is, under our normal period when the average copper in the tailings was .12, the loss in pounds of copper per ton was 2.40. Now, at 15 cents a pound for copper that is 36 cents per ton of tailings, that was lost.

Q. 207. Then I am correct, am I not, that these three columns, "Loss Per ton, 15, 20, 25, 30—four columns, that simply represents the value of metallic copper in the tailings under the different columns represented?

A. Yes.

Q. 208. Now, we have next here "abnormal loss per ton tailings."

A. Abnormal loss, pounds copper per ton tailings.

Q. 209. That is simply the weight of the copper

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

in the tailings under those different conditions?

A. No, that is the abnormal loss; that is the difference.

Q. 210. How do you figure the abnormal loss?

A. Why, in this: we consider for that period covered, from December 25th, 1916, to March 24th, 1917, which we have considered a normal period for the purpose of comparison—the pounds of copper there, you will notice, loss in tailings—the pounds of copper per ton is 2.40. The corresponding figure on the next line, which is of date March 25th, is 4.82. Now that is the actual loss, 4.82, so we consider the abnormal loss the difference between that and the average loss of the normal period, which in this case would be 2.42.

Q. 211. The 2.42 in the abnormal loss column is arrived at by taking 2.4 from 4.82?

A. Yes.

Q. 212. Then here in this abnormal loss column, that represents the actual loss under each of these conditions, minus the 2.4 pounds that you consider a normal loss?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 213. Therefore you have this abnormal loss?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 214. Then in the next column, you have simply, I take it, computed the value of what you term the abnormal loss at different prices per pound, as stated at the head of the column?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Well, we have computed the abnormal loss per ton under these varying conditions, and at the different prices, and also the abnormal loss per day, which is figured on the actual tonnage of the tailing which went out at that high figure.

Q. 215. Now, give us the range of loss that you mentioned how that figure per day at, will say, fifteen cent copper?

A. The abnormal loss per day at fifteen cent copper on the days on which we endeavored to use fifteen pounds of oil per ton, are as follows: On March 25th we actually used 16.17 pounds, and the abnormal loss is \$300.93.

Q. 216. Per day?

A. On that day; that is the actual figure of the amount of tailing which went out with that abnormal amount of copper in it. On March 26th using 15.84 pounds of oil per ton of feed, the abnormal loss was on that day \$394.84.

On March 27th, when 16.33 pounds of oil was used per ton of feed, the abnormal loss is \$300.70.

On March 28th with 16.41 pounds of oil per ton of feed, the abnormal loss was \$404.46.

On March 30th—

Q. 217. Mr. Conrads, you might state whether these losses kept on increasing, or whether they decreased, and what maximum and minimum they finally arrived at?

A. The loss increases almost constantly, with the

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

reduction in the amount of oil used per ton of material treated; and on the last test which was conducted on April 2nd with 4.16 pounds of oil per ton of feed, the abnormal loss at 15 cent copper amounts to \$2,912.17.

Q. 218. Now what would that amount to at thirty cent copper; just twice as much?

A. At thirty cent copper it would be \$5,824.34 abnormal loss for the day.

Q. 219. Did you make such efforts as were possible to get the best results under all the different conditions recorded upon exhibit 38?

A. I did; I made a special effort to see that the best results were obtained that we could possibly obtain under the varying conditions.

Q. 220. What oil mixture did you use that day; does that appear on this tabulation?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. 221. I don't believe it does.

A. Let us see. That is not on there, but we used a mixture of fifty per cent of Jones oil, 37 1-2 per cent of Lyoth fuel oil.

Q. 222. What is that Lyoth oil?

A. It is a California fuel oil that we receive from Lyoth, California, and we give it that name—and also 12 1-2 per cent of American creosote.

Q. 223. Is that a mixture that you have found suitable for use in operating with over twenty pounds per ton?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. That exact mixture we had not used for a very long period.

Q. 224. You have used it on other occasions than during these tests recorded in exhibit 38?

A. We used it on the day before, and one reason for not having used it for a longer period was on account of the difficulty we have had in getting a sufficient amount of Jones oil, that I was never able to work that down to get just exactly the combination that I am perfectly satisfied with, on account of not having ample supply of oil at all times for the purpose.

Q. 225. Do you know any facts to explain the reason these results deteriorated with the decrease of oil, whereas in some of your experience you have obtained good results with small amounts of oil?

A. Yes, we can get good results with small amounts of oil, very much smaller than this, and have done it, but with entirely different oils.

Q. 226. You think it is simply a question of the oil, the quantity to be used?

A. Yes. The conditions with the lower amounts of oil—we have not changed our conditions in the plant; the agitation of the feed, the flow of the pulp, or any of those conditions were not changed. And there is another thing that we never took into account in using the small amount of oil, that is, in that period covered by this exhibit 35—we never did take into account the circulating oil; we have no idea

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

whether that figure given here is pounds of oil—that figure is pounds of new oil per ton.

Q. 227. As a matter of fact there was circulation in the system at that time?

A. Yes, at all times; that is our regular operation.

Q. 228. What effect would that have upon the amount of oil as stated in exhibit 35?

A. Well, it would increase it; to just exactly what amount it is impossible to say, but it is very probable that in some of those cases it might have gotten up to one per cent, or certainly over half of one per cent, which would be ten or twelve pounds, easily.

WHEREUPON an adjournment was taken until 2:00 P. M., Friday, April 20th, 1917.

Friday, April 20th, 1917, 2:00 P. M.

Q. 229. Mr. Conrads, have you made any observation or do you know any facts that go to show what becomes of the oil what is used in these operations—more particularly with a large amount of oil?

A. I have nothing but my own observations; that is, I have made no definite calculations as to where it goes.

Q. 230. You mean no assays?

A. No assays.

Q. You have made some observations that throw some light on this question?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Yes, I have.

Q. 231. Will you state what they are?

A. Since using the greater amount of oil I have noticed a considerably greater amount of froth which collects in the concentrate bins, or the bins into which the concentrate is run for drying, and from which it is shipped.

Q. 232. The completed concentrate?

A. Yes, the finished concentrate. As to the definite proportion or any assay, I could not say, but from observation I have noticed this froth has accumulated in some cases easily as much as a foot and a half deep on top of the bin.

Q. 233. How deep are these bins?

A. Those bins are fifteen by twenty-two and a half, each bin, in area.

Q. 234. They are that wide and that long?

A. Yes, that is the area of each individual bin; we have sixteen of these bins in service, concrete bins.

Q. 235. And you noticed this in the bins that were receiving concentrate which had large quantities of oil?

A. Well, our flotation concentrate does not go to the bins separately, but it is elevated into the general high grade concentrate launders from the entire plant.

Q. 236. And all the concentrates go together?

A. Yes, they flow on to the concentrate bins, and the distribution of the loading of those bins is simply governed as a matter of convenience, that is as to where the load goes at any particular time, depending on which bins are full, which bins we are loading out

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

of and which are empty. Consequently there is an overflow, if the concentrate is going into one bin—before that bin is solid concentrate, there is quite a good deal of water and other material in general which overflows into the succeeding bins, and naturally that accumulates in different places.

Q. 237. And what did you notice in these bins?

A. I remember distinctly at one time I had one of the men that work there try to see if he could ascertain the depth of that froth on the concentrate bins,—on one of the bins, and he did not get to the bottom of it; he reached in probably—I should say to a depth of a foot and a half, at least that.

Q. 238. Did you ever do anything with this froth in the way of examining it or investigating it?

A. Yes, I attempted at one time to see if it would be possible or practicable to attempt the recovery of the oil from it.

Q. 239. How did you know there was oil in it?

A. Well, it is evident that it is a froth from the flotation plant; it is an oil froth; you can see the nature of it; and while there is more or less always, or always has been in my time at the plant—of course, during the period that I have been there they have been using the flotation process on the low grade stuff, and we always have a certain amount of that froth in evidence, but it is so much greater—

Q. 240. How does the quantity of that compare when you are using less than one per cent, say four or five pounds of oil, with the times when you are using twenty pounds?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Well, the amount of froth with the greater amount of oil is greatly increased, there is a great deal more of it. I attempted to see if it were practicable to recover any oil from that, but after accumulating it for at least ten days or two weeks, I don't remember exactly, we attempted to break the froth down and draw the oil from it, and on close observation I could see that it was almost completely filled with very fine solid matter, probably concentrate and perhaps some silica; solid matter, mineral, probably and some fine silica for that matter—but with solid matter. It was very heavy in it, and I took some of that sample and tried to separate it in a centrifuge, a centrifugal machine. I did get some oil separated. These were not quantitative tests, simply observation. I did get some oil separated, and also quite an amount, relatively, of that fine solid matter. As I said before, with the fine mineral and perhaps silicious matter also,—from that the centrifuge would not make the separation, that is, separate out the solid matter from the oil.

Q. 241. Well, the liquid in which the solid matter was contained—was that all oil or was it oil and water or what?

A. Well, that had some water in it.

Q. 242. What?

A. That had some water in it. This froth itself, in taking a small sample like that, you naturally get some water with it.

Q. 243. Were you able to observe with certainty that there was oil present in the liquid which was separate from this froth which you spoke of?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. From the experiment with the centrifuge?

Q. 244. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 245. Have you ever made any observations with regard to the effectiveness of the different oils which you have used in this mixture?

A. The general characteristics of the oils?

Q. 246. Their characteristics and their effectiveness in contributing to the result.

A. Yes. We have had that more or less forced upon us in failure to obtain sufficient supplies of oil that we would select in combination. For instance, we use generally, Jones oil, we use in our combination quite regularly, but at times our supply has been completely exhausted and we have been forced to use what oils we had on hand. For instance, that fuel oil, the Lyoth fuel oil, I have used that entirely alone; I have used it in combination with American creosote and I have used various proportions of Jones oil, Lyoth fuel oil and American creosote and I have used also combinations of Jones oil and Yaryan pine, small amounts of Yaryan pine as a frothing agent as the Jones oil has not sufficient frothing qualities.

Q. 247. Have you statements showing the results for individual days, separate from the time you began to use large quantities of oil?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 248. I wish you would produce such statements. (Witness produced the statements.)

Q. 249. These statements cover what months?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. I have one which covers a period from December 25th to 31st inclusive.

Q. 250. 1916?

A. 1916, yes.

Q. 251. And then what months in 1917?

A. The entire months of January and February and March and the month of April, from the first to the seventh inclusive.

Q. 252. These statements contain the data from which the summary statements that we have already had before us were compiled, do they not?

A. From which that monthly summary was compiled, yes, sir.

Q. 253. That really covers the same ground does it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 254. Except that, naturally, they exhibit each day separate instead of in monthly summary?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 255. So that what you have stated about the other exhibits containing the monthly statement, with regard to your having charge of the operations, will apply equally to these statements?

A. Absolutely, yes, sir.

Q. 256. And you therefore know them to be correct in the same sense that you knew the other ones to be correct?

A. Exactly.

MR. SCOTT: I will then offer in evidence these statements, showing the results by days, the first en-

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

titled "Utah Copper Company, Magna Plant, Metallurgical Department, Composite Flotation Retreatment Plant Results, December 25th to 31st, 1916, inclusive."

MR. GARRISON: Our standing objection, if your honor please.

THE COURT: Very well, overruled.

The statement is admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 39.

MR. SCOTT: The next one entitled, "Utah Copper Company, Magna Plant, Metallurgical Department, Composite Flotation Retreatment Plant Results, Month of January, 1917."

MR. GARRISON: The standing objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

The document was admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 40.

MR. SCOTT: The next one entitled "Utah Copper Company, Magna Plant, Metallurgical Department, Composite Flotation Plant Results, Month of February, 1917."

MR. GARRISON: The same objection.

THE COURT: Overruled

The statement was admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT NO. 41.

MR. SCOTT: The next one is entitled: "Utah Copper Company, Magna Plant, Metallurgical Department, Composite Flotation Retreatment Plant Results, Month of March, 1917."

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

MR. GARRISON: Same objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

The statement was admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 42.

MR. SCOTT: The next one is entitled "Utah Copper Company, Magna Plant, Metallurgical Department, Flotation Retreatment Plant Results, for the Period April 1 and 7, 1917, Inclusive.

MR. GARRISON: The same objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

The statement was admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT No. 43.

MR. SCOTT: On these reports I will state that we only have two copies, but will have more made this evening, as soon as court adjourns, to supply the other side.

MR. GARRISON: Is there anything we can follow in the examination of the witness.

MR. SCOTT: I am not going to examine him any further about them, except to find out if the same general plan was followed in the preparation of these statements as was followed in the monthly summary.

Q. 257. The same general plan was followed in compiling these daily statements as was followed in the monthly ones, was it not?

A. The same general plan, yes.

Q. 258. The only essential difference is that the data is set forth in 24 hour periods instead of averages for the month, is it not?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Yes, sir. There is a further slight difference, about the only difference that I recall right now, between these various statements is that from December 25, 1916, to January 16, 1917, inclusive, no oil was credited from circulation. There was a circulating load carried but it was not taken into account. From January 17th to March 3d, inclusive, that circulating oil was taken as new oil.

Q. 259. Without making any allowance for the increased tonnage due to the solids in the middlings?

A. Yes, sir. From March 4 to 24 inclusive the circulating oil in excess of 20 pounds per ton of dry pulp in circulation was credited as new oil. Then immediately following that comes a period of these tests with various amounts of oil.

Q. 260. These are the tests upon the abnormal costs statement?

A. Yes, in which that is specified, when we credit as 15 pounds and 10 and 5, respectively.

Q. 261. And this brings the report down to the end of the period?

A. The report down to April 7th.

Q. 262. Mr. Conrads, before you leave the stand you might detach from your book the copy of these exhibits so that counsel for the other side may have them to look at while cross examining you. You have copies of them in that book?

A. I have the copies, but I will have nothing to refer to.

MR. GARRISON: Has he copies besides these?

THE WITNESS: I have my own file copy.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

X-Q. 263. Going back to the operations from August 1915, to and including December 24, 1916, I do not observe that the table, exhibit 35, gives any information as to the oils that were used. Can you supply that information generally?

A. I can supply it in detail, Mr. Williams, by reference to my notes—that is, I think I have quite sufficient detail.

X-Q. 264. It wouldn't be a very long matter, would it?

A. If you care to refer to it by days. I haven't the monthly statement made up of the various days of the months, you see, comparison by a month, but I can get that data for you on any particular day or days.

MR. GARRISON: You can make out a table for us and furnish it to us, can't you?

A. I can, but it will require quite a great deal of time.

MR. GARRISON: It would require infinitely more time if we ask you question by question, day by day?

MR. SCOTT: Will the stenographer please read the question?

(Question read as follows: "Going back to the operations from August, 1915 to and including December 24, 1916, I do not observe that the table, exhibit 35, gives any information as to the oils that were used. Can you supply that information generally? A. I can

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

supply it in detail, Mr. Williams, by reference to my notes—that is, I think I have quite sufficient detail.

Q. It wouldn't be a very long matter, would it.")

X-Q. 265. Were frequent changes in the oil used during that period, or was there a comparative stability?

A. Generally a comparative stability. There were changes and trials of new combinations, etc., at times.

X-Q. 266. Well, what in general were the oils that you used during that period?

A. That is referring to the period subsequent to August?

X-Q. 267. From August, 1915, when you went to the plant, up to December 24th, 1916, when you changed to large quantities of oil?

A. I have this in a manner here which I think will go over that as you desire, Mr. Williams. In the month of August, 191⁵, Barrett creosote, Barrett No. 4, Jones oil, pine oil and No. 642—that is reconstructed pine oil. That was used on the first of the month.

X-Q. 268. In what proportions?

A. We used 520 pounds of Barrett creosote, 645 pounds of Barrett No. 4, 778 pounds of Jones oil, 197 pounds of pine oil, and 333 pounds of No. 642.

X-Q. 269. That was the total for the month?

A. No, that was the first day of August.

X-Q. 270. That was the total amount of oil used on that day?

A. On that day.

X-Q. 271. Now what was the total tonnage of material treated on that day?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. On that day we treated for one section 224 tons, and for the other 324 tons, total 548 tons.

X-Q. 272. Now, give me another typical day?

A. We changed them to Barrett creosote, Jones and pine oil on the second, and Barrett creosote, Jones and pine and No. 642 on the 3rd and 4th. There is a period from the 16th to the 31st we used Barrett No. 4, Lewis creosote, Jones oil, pine oil and No. 642.

X-Q. 273. Give me the proportions on that day, first of the oil and then of the material, say the 24th?

A. August 24th we used 431 pounds of Barrett No. 4, 949 pounds of Jones, 319 pounds of Lewis, 291 pounds of pine, 555 pounds of No. 642.

X-Q. 274. What tonnage did you treat on that day?

A. The tonnage for one section was 226 and for the other 322; that makes 548 total.

X-Q. 275. Now, can you run along and tell when any very substantial change was made?

A. Take the month of September I think we used the same combination.

X-Q. 276. Then never mind.

A. That was used from the first to the 6th, the 21st to the 24th, and the 28th to the 30th.

X-Q. 277. Then in October was there any substantial change?

A. It is essentially the same, Mr. Williams; we used Jones, Lewis Creo, Barrett 4 and 642.

X-Q. 278. Then we will run along in 1916 and take it about the middle of 1916 and see what you were using?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. When would you like?

X-Q. 279. August, 1916, if you were running regularly then?

A. Yes. In August, 1916, we used Jones oil, American creosote, and Weaste, which is another creosote oil, and the trade name that we received it under is Weaste. That was used from the 1st to the 10th inclusive.

X-Q. 280. And the amount for each day?

A. What day would you like; that was used from the 1st to the 10th.

X-Q. 281. Say the 5th?

A. On the 5th we used 2000 pounds of Jones oil, 666 pounds of American creosote and 666 pounds of Weaste oil.

X-Q. 282. And the tonnage of material treated on that day?

A. The tonnage was 935 tons of heading.

X-Q. 283. Total?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 284. Now, suppose we come back to December 24th, the last day of the series. There was no change made then; you were running regularly then, about as you had before?

A. There were changes at times; as I said before we have not been able at all times—that is, we have changed our combinations according to the various oils. We have used, for instance, Barrett No. 4, Weaste and Jones, and we have used Lewis creosote and Jones oil and so forth, such things as that.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

X-Q. 285. I see that the average for the month in pounds of oil per ton, for the month of December is 3.83, and let us see now if on the last day, December 24th, you were running about the average; you were not getting ready for the change or anything like that?

A. Well, on December 24th we started to use the increased amount in the afternoon, and the only reason that it was not included here is because the 25th was the first entire day that we used the increased amount.

X-Q. 286. Then you had better take about the 15th of December?

A. All right, sir. On the 15th of December, 1916, we used 1922 pounds of Jones oil, 1704 pounds of American creosote, making a total of 3626 pounds, and we treated 970 tons.

X-Q. 287. Now, when, in December, commencing on the 25th, did you settle down to normal conditions. You started to use this large amount of oil, and of course I assume it took you a little while to get the plant settled; about when did that happen?

A. Well, it was not so much getting the plant settled, Mr. Williams, as it was being able to gauge that increased flow of oil accurately; that was the particular difficulty. It was about the 30th when we got that sufficiently under control to be able to hold it as closely, or fairly closely to what we wanted.

X-Q. 288. I see that on the 31st of December your original feed was 20.72 pounds to the ton; is that right?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. That is right.

X-Q. 289. Now I would like you to give me the amount of the respective oils; you have given their percentages in the table, but give me the amount of oil that you fed on that day, as to the respective oils?

A. On that day we used 14,806 pounds of Jones oil, and 779 pounds of Yaryan pine.

X-Q. 290. And on that day you used 11 cells; what does that mean; did you use 11 circulating cells? You say "the number of cells circulating."

A. By referring to the diagram you will see that that means that 5 cells were producing finished concentrates, and 11 were producing middlings, which were returned to the circulating feed.

X-Q. 291. Now, on that day, this 20.72 pounds per ton was the original feed of oil, was it?

A. Yes, sir, that is new oil per ton.

X-Q. 292. And does this table show what you have spoken of as the circulating oil?

A. No, sir, it does not. If you remember, I mentioned that during this period we took no account of the circulating oil.

X-Q. 293. Now, when will I find a day when you took account of the circulating oil?

A. Just refer to your month of January please.

X-Q. 294. Somewhere about the middle of January, is that right?

A. January 17th.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

X-Q. 295. Was the plant running continuously from January 17th on to the end of the month?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 296. You did not stop to make any experiments or you did not alter the condition, you were running on normal conditions?

A. Yes. Now we had circulation before that; we had actually a circulating load, but we did not take it into account and we did not determine the amount of oil; that was not any change in operation, it was simply a change in the method of accounting, and accounting for that circulating oil, which had not been taken into account before.

X-Q. 297. Now, will you mark on your sketch the point at which you took out the material for the purpose of getting the measurement of that circulating oil; just mark it on your sketch, exhibit 37?

A. Right here, where we took the sample from which is determined the oil in circulation; that is, the oil which is returned in that circulating load.

X-Q. 298. That is somewhere in the sludge tank?

A. No, sir; the launder comes in above the sludge tank, right above it, and empties directly into it, and we got our sample right at this point, at the mouth of that launder.

X-Q. 299. That is, before the launder dumps its load into the tank?

A. No, as the material leaves the launder going into the tank, we cut the stream where it is entirely

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

free from the launder. We do not take it in the launder.

X-Q. 300. That is you take it as it is falling down from the launder to the tank?

A. As it is discharged into the tank. We take our sample there for the percentage of oil, and for the percentage of solids in the feed. Now, as a matter of convenience we take the feed—that is the tonnage sample of the circulating feed—before it gets here, because it is really a very inconvenient place to get on top of that tank and take it, so we plug or shut off the feed there.

X-Q. 301. In the launder?

A. In the launder.

X-Q. 302. That is before it enters the tank?

A. We put a gate in the launder, and we have a six inch hole, and we allow that to run until the full flow is carried, and we have been sure to see that that hole is made large enough that there will be no retarding, that it is ample to take the entire flow, and we let that run until the stream is steady and we see there is no accumulation in the launder, then we take a time sample, taking the entire feed, and we weigh that, and that gives us the total weight of the sample, of course, for a given definite period. We get our solid sample here, indicating the sample to determine the percentage of solids, and the percentage of solids is derived from that sample, from that we calculate the tonnage of feed for twenty-four

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

hours, knowing the total amount of feed for a given length of time.

X-Q. 303. Will you mark an "A" at the point where you measure your tonnage?

A. Of the circulating load. How would it be to put a cross there and indicate on the side?

X-Q. 304. Put an "X" at the point in the launder and run a leader from it outside?

A. Now how do I mark it?

X-Q. 305. Mark it with a big "A." Now, the other point that you have described is simply the overflow, the water falls from the launder?

A. It is simply the stream after leaving the mouth of the launder as it discharges into the sludge tank.

X-Q. 306. That sludge tank is it ever full to overflowing?

A. No, I have never seen the sludge tank full; that is, it is perfectly clean, a clean fall; that is, it does not interfere in getting the sample.

X-Q. 307. And how deep is the sludge tank, about?

A. The sludge tank is—I will tell you exactly in a minute. Eight feet diameter by ten feet deep.

X-Q. 308. What is it that maintains in the tank a circulation such as prevents sediments?

A. There is a continuous discharge from the bottom of the tank, the flow going in at the top, the discharge being drawn off from the bottom, I should say, would prevent that as much as anything else.

X-Q. 309. You do not have any stirrers of any kind inside of the sludge tank?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. No. There was at one time some air pipes put in simply to prevent any accumulation there, but that doesn't bother any, any accumulation of sediment in the bottom of the sludge tank.

X-Q. 310. Now, what goes into that sludge tank is the new feed and the return middlings?

A. The circulating load from the return cells.

X-Q. 311. And the new feed?

A. And the new feed, yes, sir.

X-Q. 312. Nothing else goes into it?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 313. And what comes out of it is what?

A. Just exactly what goes into it.

X-Q. 314. Well, is it the feed of the flotation plant?

A. Yes; yes, sir.

X-Q. 315. That is to say, everything that goes in there, goes out into the feed of the flotation plant?

A. Yes. There is the new, original feed coming in; there is the circulating load coming at another launder. From the bottom we tap that mixture of new feed and circulating load.

X-Q. 316. What is your habit as to taking these samples out; how frequently during the day and for what period?

A. These samples are taken at hourly intervals, regularly.

X-Q. 317. And for how long a period?

A. They are taken for a period depending on the amount of the flow. We have a large tub into

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

which we tap that sample. When that return flow is extremely heavy we can not get it for quite as long a time as when it is a lighter flow. Our endeavor is to get as large a sample as possible. Generally speaking, though, we will take a 15 second sample, sometimes a 20.

X-Q. 318. Is it an automatic sampler?

A. No; no, sir.

X-Q. 319. A man times it, or a boy?

A. As I explained to you, we plug that launder; we put a gate in the launder to stop the flow, and at the same time pull the plug from the hole in the bottom of the launder, which, by the way, is very close to this gate so that there can be no accumulation in the same; the hole is amply large to take the full flow and we allow that to run until we are quite sure that the normal flow is coming, and then we cut our tub under and there is a stop watch to take the exact time.

X-Q. 320. Now what does that circulating load consist of?

A. The circulating load consists of the material that is overflowed from the Spitzkastens of the cells which are not producing a finished concentrate.

X-Q. 321. That is the froth?

A. Froth and more or less of the pulp and water.

X-Q. 322. That is to say, your overflow is such a free overflow that water goes with the froth?

A. We have froth removers pulling that over, and

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

in pulling that froth there is a certain amount of water accompanies the pulp.

X-Q. 323. And that is the material which is in this circulating load, the froth, the water, and whatever goes with it as an overflow through these machines?

A. That overflow is run over from those cells which are not making a finished concentrate.

X-Q. 324. Take January 26th. On that day you computed as your total pounds of oil per ton, 20.17, while the oil that you fed into the plant was 14.32 pounds per ton. Is that right?

A. That is the figure which appears. I am quite sure it is right.

X-Q. 325. Now, as I understand what these figures represent is the material that flows from the sludge tank into the flotation plant head added to it, just after it left the sludge tank?

A. Oil in the proportion of 14.32 pounds per ton.

X-Q. 326. The dry material is the pulp; is that right?

A. Of dry material in the original feed.

X-Q. 327. And that dry material fed to the plant was 1003 tons, is that right?

A. On the 26th?

X-Q. 328. On the 26th?

A. I so have it, yes.

X-Q. 329. So that on that day you fed into the

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

plant 1003 dry tons of material to be treated and you fed into the plant oil at the rate of 14.32 pounds to the ton of that material and according to your computation the pulp that went into the flotation machine contained 20.17 pounds of oil to the ton of dry material that went into the flotation machine?

A. To the ton of dry material of the original feed, not including any tonnage or solid material which was returned in the circulating load.

X-Q. 330. Which, of course, would have reduced that?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 331. That is to say, in this calculation you do not take into account all dry material that came around in the circulating load?

A. No, as explained before, Mr. Williams, this is a period during which we did not take into account the dry material, nor attempt to satisfy that with oil, in the circulating load.

X-Q. 332. Well, now, let's get into some time when you did all of that, had all of your refinements.

A. I beg your pardon, Mr. Williams, just a minute. You asked me to mark this exhibit No. 37, which I did, with the point indicated where we take that tonnage sample, and I have indicated here with the letter "A." Now you wished another indication there where we took the sample for determining the percentage of solids.

X-Q. 333. I think your sketch sufficiently indicates

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

the end of the launder, but if you will just draw a line across it, then your description that you took it as it overflowed into the tank, is sufficient.

A. All right, sir.

X-Q. 334. Now where will we find a computation in which you had all your refinements of calculation?

A. You will find that from the 4th of March on.

X-Q. 335. Take March 19.

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 336. On that day, according to the showing of your table, exhibit 42, the total pounds of oil per ton entering the flotation machine was 20.27; is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 337. And that is the pounds per ton in relation to all of the new material that went into the flotation machine; is that right?

A. That is on what day, Mr. Williams, please?

X-Q. 338. March 19th.

A. That is the total pounds of oil per ton of original feed, after satisfying the dry tonnage in the circulating load with 20 pounds of oil per ton.

X-Q. 339. Therefore, according to your calculation a portion slightly in excess of 20 pounds of oil to the ton of material entered the flotation machines: is that right?

A. As I explained, there was 20 pounds of oil per ton allowed from the amount of oil in the circulating feed, 20 pounds of that oil per ton of the dry

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

pulp contained in the circulating feed. The balance we considered excess oil.

X-Q. 340. Well, let us find out how much oil there was per ton of material in the circulating feed; does your table show that in one of the numerous columns?

A. I think we can find that in one of the numerous columns.

X-Q. 341. I find the figure 66.23 which seems to be under that heading, "Pounds Oil Per Ton in Circulation." Is that is, under the general heading "Circulation Feed"?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 342. That is circulation feed?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 343. That material?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 344. Concentrate not rich enough to take away. Contained 66.23 pounds of oil per ton of material?

A. Dry material.

X-Q. 345. Of dry material?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 346. And pounds of new oil per ton of original feed was 12.38?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 347. Now, assuming that the pulp which flowed into the flotation machine contained material which was a mixture of mineral and gangue and con-

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

tained oil and the relationship between the two was such that there were 20.27 pounds of oil per ton of new material—

A. (Interrupting) of original feed—excuse me.

X-Q. 348. Well, as I am endeavoring to grasp these figures and I don't live with them, as you do, you were assured, you said, that all the material that went in there, had oil, and amount of oil with it, that there was a proportion of 20 pounds and a little more, per ton of material. That, you said, you were sure of.

A. Let me, if you will—Perhaps if I can explain and clarify the matter,—

X-Q. 349. I will be pleased to have you do so.

A. All right, sir, I will endeavor to. You understand what makes up our circulating load.

X-Q. 350. Yes, it is made up of the concentrate that is not good enough to send away, and some water, and of course with the concentrate there is some gangue and with the concentrate there is a great deal of oil, ~~that~~ that is what it is made up of is it not?

A. In general it is the overflow from the Spitzkasten of the cells which are not producing a finished concentrate. Now, we determine the amount of oil in that circulating load. We get that in pounds. We also determine the dry tonnage of pulp in that circulating load. Then multiply the dry tonnage in that circulating load by 20 which gives us the number

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

of pounds of oil which we must allow for that material which is entering the head of the machine, in addition to the new feed. Now, we have satisfied that with 20 pounds of oil. We then have in this case—generally have—the excess. If we should have a deficit we make that up with new oil. Generally we have a surplus.

X-Q. 351. In figures?

A. In oil.

X-Q. 352. As shown by figures?

A. Certainly, that is the only means we have.

X-Q. 353. It might be speaking ^{of} the concentrates, of course, but you have an excess in figures?

A. We have that oil; we find that out.

X-Q. 354. Yes.

A. We first satisfy the dry tonnage in the circulating feed with its 20 pounds, and the excess—that is added to the total amount of new oil that is put in, and this total amount is divided by the original tonnage of new feed which gives us this figure here.

X-Q. 355. The figure 20.27?

A. Whatever that is—20.27.

X-Q. 356. Is this excess free oil?

A. Now you have asked me a question which I am sure that I can not say.

X-Q. 357. Well, you don't know?

A. We know that that ^{is} oil—We determine that and find that the oil is in there, but, as to just what condition it all is, or how much enters—how much of

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

it is free, how much of it is emulsified in the pulp, how much of it is coating mineral substances, that I can not say.

X-Q. 358. Wouldn't your analysis enable you to detect that, if you took this material and separated the water?

A. There might be a determination of that made. We have not made it.

X-Q. 359. You have not made any determination of it?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 359½. The oil might be all adhered to the concentrate, or the mineral or a part of it attached to the mineral and a part of it running around in the water, or a part of it on the gangue that was there? Is that right?

A. As to what condition it is, Mr. Williams, I do not know. I have never made a determination of the state or condition of it in that circulating feed.

THE COURT: He asks if it could be one of these things he mentions. Could it be, in your opinion?

A. It could be.

X-Q. 360. BY MR. WILLIAMS: Now, all of this oil that goes in with the circulating feed has been through at least as many of the flotation machines as are supplying a concentrate which is taken away? That is true, isn't it?

A. No, not necessarily because it might come off

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

of the 5th cell and not been through the remaining eleven.

X-Q. 361. My question is: All of this oil has been through at least as many of these machines as are supplying a concentrate, a finished concentrate? That is right, is it not?

A. Yes. It is not taken off until it passes that portion of the machine which is making finished concentrates.

X-Q. 362. You might tell me what number of cells on that day were producing finished concentrates and what number of cells were producing circulating feed, as you call it.

A. That was on the 19th of March, I believe, was it not?

X-Q. 363. Yes, 19th.

A. I have here on my notation on that day's results, "Concentrates from 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 cells to bins. Product from balance of cells to circulation; tailings to waste."

X-Q. 364. That number that you have there, does that show that machines 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were in the circuit or not?

A. What numbering do you refer to?

X-Q. 365. You said 6 to 10 were producing finished concentrates. How about 1 to 6?

A. Well, that is the total number of cells, does not refer to the numbers.

X-Q. 366. That is the total number?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. That is the number of cells.

X-Q. 367. One to six?

A. That would be six cells.

X-Q. 368. And one to ten?

A. Would be ten cells.

X-Q. 369. Out of the 16?

A. And that is varied according to the conditions.

X-Q. 370. That is to say, if the observer notices that the froth in No. 7 is not quite as good as it ought to be, he switches it out.

A. That is left to the operator. For instance if he has six cells for a period of time that are making a finished concentrate, conditions change so that the sixth cell is not making a grade of concentrate which in his estimation is sufficiently clean, he cuts in that cell to the circulating load and out of the high grade.

X-Q. 371. So that at some time that day machines 1 to 10 were supplying a finished concentrate?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 372. And the other machines, 11 to 16, were supplying the circulating load?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 373. Now, I thought that your table showed—but perhaps you can supply it—what was the condition of the feed to the first emulsifier of the flotation plant as to the proportion of oil to solids?

A. That would be—I haven't that figure, Mr. Williams. That would be the total tonnage—that is, the

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

average proportion would be the total tonnage of that day which was 1031, was it not?

X-Q. 374. Yes.

A. That would be 1031 tons of new feed with 20.27 pounds of oil per ton, plus the dry tonnage in circulation, 176 tons, with its oil at 20 pounds per ton. We don't carry that figure in that way.

X-Q. 375. I would just like to have that figure. It doesn't seem to me it is a very difficult calculation.

A. No, I can make it. I believe you will find that is right, if I have not made a mistake, 20.23.

X-Q. 376. Twenty and twenty-three hundredths pounds of oil to the ton of dry material in the feed to the flotation machine which enter the first emulsifier, is that right?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 377. Now that material goes through these three emulsifiers in series and there is no loss of material at all, nothing leaves it, it just goes right through one after the other, is that right?

A. There is nothing discharged from that, that is, except from 1 to 6 in the series.

X-Q. 378. There is no loss of material?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 379. Nothing taken off?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 380. That is, it enters the first flotation machine?

A. Yes, sir.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

X-Q. 381. Now, what takes place in that first flotation machine?

A. The material is agitated in the cell and it rises by the centrifugal force of the propellers and overflows under a light baffle into the Spitzkasten.

X-Q. 382. One on each side?

A. One on each side, yes.

X-Q. 383. And have you given the speed of the rotation?

A. 570 revolutions per minute.

X-Q. 384. And the diameter of the impellers or agitators?

A. The lower impeller I think is 14 1-2 inches exactly.

X-Q. 385. And the upper impeller is a little larger?

A. Twenty inches.

X-Q. 386. And alongside of the lower part of the machine and extending on up to the top of the impeller there are vertical baffles?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 387. So that there is a terrific agitation in that machine?

A. Yes, there is.

X-Q. 388. And the material is thrown out at the top of the machine?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 389. And drops into a sort of launder or chamber?

A. Under the motor. The motor stands on its own base just above that cell, vertically, and in which

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

this impeller revolves. The material is forced up to the top and overflows into the Spitzkastens on the side.

X-Q. 390. And when it gets into the Spitzkastens what happens the froth, the concentrate bearing froth which accumulates at the top?

A. That is removed by the froth removers, blades.

X-Q. 391. Slowly revolving blades.

A. Paddles that are driven by a revolving shaft and simply remove the concentrate.

P. 2710, L. 12, insert "and from the spitzkastens" after "Spitzkastens"

... being constantly removed in the operation of the machine and that is the finished froth of machine No. 1?

A. Yes; the head cells make a finished concentrate.

X-Q. 393. How much oil is removed in that concentrate?

A. I have never determined that.

X-Q. 394. A considerable amount of oil goes with the concentrate there, doesn't there?

A. There is quite a great deal of oil goes with the concentrate.

X-Q. 395. Now, from this first machine you have first an overflow of froth carrying with it a considerable amount of oil, and then you have the tailing, haven't you? which goes into the second machine?

A. Yes, that flows between—that flows through

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

the division between the cells it is provided with a gate which is open practically at the point of the bottom of this Spitzkasten, and which is raised and lowered to regulate the flow through the machine.

X-Q. 396. And all the ⁺ma[^]terial that that second machine receives is what flows to it as the tailing from the first machine, is that right?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 397. And that material has been denuded of the oil by reason of the fact that the concentrate carrying a great amount of oil has flowed off, isn't that right?

A. Denuded, no, but some, some has been removed.

X-Q. 398. A good deal of it has been removed?

A. There is some removed; there is quite a good deal left.

X-Q. 399. And in fact you have got down now below twenty pounds to the ton of the material treated, haven't you?

A. I have never made a determination of that at that particular part of the machine.

X-Q. 400. In view of the fact that you were so close to the line when you started, 20.23 and in view of the fact that you have taken off a great deal of that oil, it is reasonable to assume that you have lowered now to a condition where you have less than twenty pounds of oil to the ton of material, isn't it?

A. Well, at that point it may be that we have less than twenty pounds to the ton. We have more than

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

twenty to start with, and that is where we make our calculations.

X-Q. 401. Now, from machine No. 1 we have got this material which has lost some of its oil into machine No. 2. Now, the same thing happens in there as happened in No. 1?

A. The same proceeding, yes.

X-Q. 402. It is only the tailings of machine No. 2 that get into machine No. 3 from No. 2?

A. The tailing from No. 2, or what you might consider the tailing.

X-Q. 403. It is what is left after that concentrate with the considerable amount of oil has overflowed?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 404. And on this day at some time there were ten machines in series, each discharging a considerable amount of concentrate, and a considerable amount of oil, and the amount of oil w^{as} being reduced in every step generally; that is right, isn't it?

A. Yes, naturally.

X-Q. 405. Every step down reduces the oil?

A. You know there is a certain amount of oil that goes off with the concentrate from each cell.

X-Q. 406. So that down at machine No. 10, the proportion of oil to dry material must have been very much below twenty pounds to the ton?

A. It probably was, yes. It doubtless was.

X-Q. 407. Then let us take machine No. 11; that would have a still lower amount of oil, and machine No. 11 operated just the same as the others, didn't it?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. On the same principle.

X-Q. 408. Only now this concentrate froth was not good enough to use, and it was sent back to be put through the machine again?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 409. An operation that is generally referred to as a cleaning operation, although in this particular instance it may be given a different name, but substantially a cleaning operation.

MR. SCOTT: Are you asking a question, Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I think so; I think that is an interrogation.

A. Well, it might be considered so. We do not regard it as a cleaning operation. Generally in referring to a cleaning operation we refer to a machine which is making—that is, for instance, like our flotation machines are concentrating and cleaning a low grade concentrate.

X-Q. 410. That is, if you put it through another machine you would call it a cleaning operation?

A. Yes, one is called a rougher and another a cleaning machine.

X-Q. 411. But through the same machine you don't call it that?

A. Well, that would be a circulating load, or the term middling is often applied to it.

X-Q. 412. But as a matter of fact that froth was subjected to retreatment in this instance to the same machine head; that froth from No. 11 did not go to

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

the finished concentrate, but went back and was subjected to retreatment in the same machine?

A. In the same machine, yes.

X-Q. 413. And then from No. 11 to No. 12, you performed the same operation, did you not, still losing a proportion of the oil?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 414. And so when you got down to No. 16, it seems to me that there must have been a very small amount of oil; you agree with that, don't you?

A. There must have been a greatly reduced amount, because there has been a great deal of it removed from the upper cells, or the cells above it.

X-Q. 415. Did you ever measure that?

A. No, sir, I have never determined those figures, except as I have stated in the general circulating load. Of course, you know, measuring that total accumulation from the returning cells.

X-Q. 416. That only gives on this day, as I understand it, an indication of what a large amount of oil is being taken off by the concentrates, doesn't it; it gives us that?

A. Well, you see here that there were 12,768 pounds of new oil added; there were 11,656 pounds of oil in circulation.

X-Q. 417. That is 11,656 pounds were in the rougher concentrates, the low grade concentrates that overflowed from the last machine of the series?

A. It was the froth that was overflowed from the cells which were returning and circulating;—the last machine of the series, yes.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

X-Q. 418. Now, have you got an assay showing the value of the concentrates which was treated as circulating load?

A. An assay of that dry product?

X-Q. 419. Yes.

A. No, I have not.

X-Q. 420. Your only determination was of the amount of oil in it?

A. The percentage of solids, the amount of oil and the tonnage.

(Whereupon a recess was taken.)

X-Q. 421. In this table of proceedings during the month of March, 1917, defendant's exhibit 42, which I observe that there are three days during which all of the 16 cells produced finished concentrate; that is right, is it not?

A. Three days, yes, sir.

X-Q. 422. Of course on those days you did not have any circulating load?

A. None whatever.

X-Q. 423. Now, if the oil in the circulating load is all attached to the concentrates, you would not be adding any oil to the new feed by carrying this circulating load containing concentrates with oil attached to it into the plant, would you?

A. If all of the oil in the circulating feed was attached to sulphide—what is the question?

X-Q. 424. Then you would not be adding any oil

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

to the new feed by putting in this sulphide with oil attached to it, would you?

A. Yes, indeed. That is still oil, Mr. Williams. Whether it be attached to mineral particles or not, that is still oil, isn't it?

X-Q. 425. Have you any experience upon which you can say that that oil leaves the concentrate or sulphide to which it was attached, and attaches itself to the new an^d unoi^led sulphide that has been fed in there?

A. No, I did not mean to convey that impression; I do not mean to say that. However, whether that oil is all attached to the sulphide particles or not, it is still oil which is returned in that circulating load.

X-Q. 426. Now, in your operations before you changed to twenty pounds or more of oil to the ton, as you have represented it to be, or believe it to be, you did not give any attention to this matter of the circulating feed, did you?

A. As to the calculation or the computation of the amount of oil, no.

X-Q. 427. You never computed it at all?

A. We always carried the circulating load, but as to its entering into our calculations as to the amount of oil which it carried and the amount of tonnage returned or the like of that, that was not computed and did not enter into our calculations. We simply calculated from the original tonnage of new feed and new oil.

X-Q. 428. THE COURT: This circulating load, is it ground additionally anywhere in the circuits?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 429. What is the object of it anyway?

A. Well, it is a concentrate—that is, it is removed in the same manner that the concentrates are removed from those cells making the finished concentrates.

X-Q. 430. Why doesn't it go out in the first circuit instead of coming back the second time?

A. Well, in the first circuit the first cells are producing a concentrate which is rich in mineral and of sufficient grade so that it can be shipped directly, it is a finished product. Now, we get down to a dividing line, as it were—we get down to a point where that froth will contain silicious matter and probably middling, which is mineral attached to gangue rock.

X-Q. 431. What I mean to ask is why that second time around these sulphides that are in the circulating load are more likely to come out in a finished product than the first time around, or is there any reason?

A. Well, it may be this, that there may be particles in there that are attached to silicious matter, or that might be involved or connected in some way with fine silicia or silicates and go over in that mass, and in that abrasion they probably would clean and become separated, that would be one reason.

X-Q. 432. All right. I wanted to understand if there was any second grinding or anything. I was of the impression that there was not.

A. No, sir, there is not.

X-Q. 433. MR. WILLIAMS: I think, responding to the line of thought of the court, that what actually

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

occurs is a repetition of the very violent agitation; that is to say, these concentrates that are not good enough, they are sent back in the circulating load to be again subjected to the agitation; that is what they are subjected to?

A. The same series, and they go in back with the fresh oil and into the original condition—that is, back to the head of the machine, and are subjected the second time and perhaps the third time; we cannot tell how many times—to that same operation.

X-Q. 434. Now, these are all Janney machines, aren't they?

A. Yes, the Janney type of machine.

X-Q. 435. Are they of the mechanical type.

A. Yes.

X-Q. 436. And do they include the compressed air chamber?

A. No, we have no air chamber; this is the mechanical type straight.

X-Q. 437. Now, you gave an illustration, an example of a crusher which received a certain amount of material for crushing, and in which there was a provision for the return of the over sized material and sending it back through the crusher. Now, if that was a roll crusher, everything that went through it was necessarily reduced to the distance between the rolls, isn't that right?

A. Well, to the distance between the rolls, but not at which they are set for grinding, because there is a provision in those crushers which allows, for instance,

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

if a piece of iron or steel gets in there, that it can go through it, for they give to a certain extent.

X-Q. 438. But the material that is crushed is not supposed to have any operation in separating the crusher rolls, is it?

A. There is a spring which allows—by which that is taken care of, which is provided for that reason.

X-Q. 439. In that example all of this material, this over size which is sent back and through the rolls again, is material that has been already crushed, although not crushed as fine as desirable?

A. It has not been crushed down to the size that is wanted, and it is not necessarily—naturally you would suppose that the greater percentage of it has been crushed, but there is a possibility that in its original form, if there were some small particles there that were over size from the standpoint of the screen or the size required to be crushed to—there might be particles which go down in that stream and pass through without being crushed. Of course the majority of it would be crushed to a greater or less degree.

X-Q. 440. Well, now, in this example you take a crusher that I think crushes ten—

A. You take a specific example?

X-Q. 441. I think I said 100 tons. 100 tons

P. 2719, After L. 28, insert "A. (interrupting) per day. I don't remember I"

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. Its original feed is 100 tons per day.

X-Q. 443. And the material that it crushes is 100 tons of material per day isn't it?

~~A. (Interrupting) per day I don't remember—I~~

A. It crushes very much more than 100 tons of material per day.

X-Q. 444. Well, what does it discharge, 100 tons per day?

A. It discharges more than that; it discharges that originally, also the circulating load.

X-Q. 445. Plus that portion of the circulating load that is discharged on that day; is that right?

A. No, not technically speaking. That is, that is not exactly the point. It receives 100 tons of material, is put in, of ore. The screening plant, under balanced conditions, that finished product which passes the screen will be 100 tons per day. That is, if the conditions balance.

X-Q. 446. And balanced conditions are the conditions that are—You adjust to attain, are they not?

A. Certainly.

X-Q. 447. And so, in the flotation machines you would have balanced conditions, or you would be thrown out of balance, isn't that right?

A. We endeavor to keep balanced conditions.

X-Q. 448. Well, don't you have to keep balanced conditions, for any considerable run?

A. You refer directly to the manner of circulation load, and its influence?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

X-Q. 449. Yes.

A. That, Mr. Williams—There is a variation in that. That is, in the amount, as you will see by these sheets, in the amount of dry feed in that circulating load. I have not been able to determine a definite percentage or a definite balance nor have I been able to see if that goes up in tonnage or up in oil or down in either one, that it necessarily upsets us.

X-Q. 450. Well, it doesn't, does it, when you are running normally, you are not upset by any great increment, and increase of oil?

A. Well, I should say that we don't normally have any great increment, that is—or such increment.

X-Q. 451. Now, in regard to these oil determinations that have appeared on your tables. Mr. Janney described a method of determination. Can that be taken as fairly representative of what you use?

A. We do not use exactly the same method of determination.

X-Q. 452. Can you tell me about how you determine the amount of oil?

A. Yes, sir. The sample, which I refer to as being taken at regular intervals for that purpose, is determined by shifts, 8 hour shifts. The pulp is thoroughly mixed and a portion is weighed and placed in an 8 ounce flask. Petroleum ether is added to the flask and the flask is corked and agitated, and after that agitation the flask is allowed to stand for a few minutes until there is a clear separation between the

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

solvent and the pulp. Now, the solvent dissolves practically all of the oil and also holds considerable material in suspension. Water is added to the flask to bring up the level, until the solvent and the oil and this mineral which is floating, up, right up into the upper part of the neck of it. That is decanted into a beaker. The beaker is put on a hot plate and the contents allowed to boil for a few minutes. Then it is removed, allowed to settle; there is a sharp, or clear separation noted of this suspended material, and the solvent. The solvent is then decanted through a filter and more petroleum ether is added to the residue remaining in the beaker. It is again boiled, it is allowed to settle and again decanted, and that operation is repeated time after time until the petroleum ether shows no coloration. The solvent is put into a four ounce Erlenmeyer flask, placed on a hot plate and the petroleum ether is driven off. When about three or four c.c. remain the flask is placed in an air bath heated below 200 degrees centigrade—that is, not above 200 degrees centigrade, until the petroleum ether is entirely driven off, and the flask is cooled and weighed. We have had a little difficulty in that way. The grade of petroleum ether which we have received has some very high fractions in it, and that we have corrected by rectifying and taking only the more volatile or lighter portions. We have also used the method of sulphuric ether and when we use that, on account of its low boiling point, we finished the operation

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

in a water bath, water heated to about boiling, and we finish the operation finally, after most of the ether is driven off, we disconnect it from the top and insert a tube with warm air and pass it through until it removes the least trace of that ether.

X-Q. 453. That describes all of the oil determination operations?

A. Yes, that is—Then of course calculations are made from the portion which as weighed originally and the amount of oil which is obtained from them, the calculation is made as to the amount in the total circulating feed, etc.

X-Q. 454. Now, you said something about making experiments in a centrifugal machine, the recovery of oil from the concentrates?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 455. Did you get anything of practical value out of it?

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 456. You do not recover any of your oil from concentrates?

A. I made that one attempt and I found that that froth which we collected from the concentrate bins was practically entirely loaded with very fine mineral, and even after making a separation, or as much of a separation as I could, there still remained what was quite apparent in treating in a centrifuge when it would separate out, that very fine material was quite apparent and we decided that it would not be prac-

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

tical to try to make the separation or recovery of oil in that way.

X-Q. 457. And in no part of your plant do you make any recovery, do you, of the oil that you put in?

A. Recovery, that is separation?

X-Q. 458. Yes.

A. And a clean recovery of oil?

X-Q. 459. Yes.

A. No, sir.

X-Q. 460. That is to say, all the oil that goes into your flotation plant goes out either with the concentrate or with the tailings?

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 461. Now, have you made any determination of the amount of oil that goes out with the tailings?

A. No. I referred to that earlier. I have never made any, except just observations on it, but as to a definite determination, I have not.

X-Q. 462. One of the oils that you referred to this morning was reconstructed pine oil. Can you describe that a little better?

A. Well, it is a pine oil which is treated with sulphur and a distillation made in this way, you see with about—I wouldn't say exactly, but I think 5 to 10% by weight of sulphur is added in this treatment.

X-Q. 463. And the oil thus treated is what kind of pine oil?

A. We call it reconstructed pine oil.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

X-Q. 464. I mean the oil that you start with?

A. That is a pine oil.

X-Q. 465. Like the Yaryan oil?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 466. Or is it the Yaryan pine?

A. I would not be positive as to whether Yaryan pine—Yes, that I am quite sure has been reconstructed, but it is a similar product.

THE COURT: Do you know how much oil goes through your concentrator?

A. I don't know, that is, I never assayed that. The only thing, as I say, your honor, is from observation only as to the attempted reclamation of it, which was a failure, or found to be impracticable on account of the great amount of fine material carried in this froth, in the difficulty in separating it, or the practical impossibility—at least we decided it was not a commercial possibility or there was no money to be saved or made by it.

X-Q. 467. I notice that in your tables you have a heading, "Reagent, Total Pounds and Pounds per Ton." What is that reagent, or what are those reagents?

A. That reagent is one which we make up at the plant of sulphur and caustic soda and lime and water.

X-Q. 468. Did you hear Mr. Janney's description of that and its characteristics, which he gave yesterday?

A. Yes, sir, I was here when he described it.

X-Q. 469. And that is the material which you are talking of?

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

A. We make it ourselves and it differs in strength from what is made at the Arthur plant. We don't make it in exactly the same proportion.

X-Q. 470. Did you use that reagent prior to December 24th?

A. 1916?

X-Q. 471. 1916.

A. Oh, yes, yes we have used that at all of the time that I have been at the plant.

X-Q. 472. Don't you give that a name, that reagent?

A. We call it Calura.

X-Q. 473. Do your tables show the proportion of solids to water, or pulp?

A. As it enters the machine?

X-Q. 474. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

X-Q. 475. Then your tables show that?

A. I am quite sure that every one does; I think so. I guess it is not on this one.

X-Q. 476. Have you any general practice?

A. I can give you that—I thought it was on these sheets.

X-Q. 477. Well, have you any general practice?

A. I can give you the exact figures by months or over long periods. Referring to exhibit No. 35 the percentage of solids for that entire period averaged 36.001. On exhibit 36, covering the period from December 25th, 1916, to April 7, 1917, inclusive, the average percent. of solid was 31.276.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

X-Q. 478. Now, I asked Mr. Janney for specimens of the various oils and he is going to get them. Can you supplement his work by seeing that we are supplied with specimens of the oils that you have used?

A. I can.

X-Q. 479. Would you be willing to do so?

A. Oh, yes, I am perfectly willing to do so, Mr. Williams, the only thing is that I am not sure that we can get specimens of all the oils that we have used at the plant. Now, with that exception only. As to the oils that we have recently used, of course we have them and I will be very glad to get them for you.

X-Q. 480. The ore at your plant is not the same as at the Arthur plant is it—is it or is it not?

A. It comes from the same mine.

X-Q. 481. Comes from the same mine?

A. Same property, yes.

X-Q. 482. So that the specimen that Mr. Janney will give will give substantially the same thing?

A. I should think that they would be all that would be needed. Of course our ore does not assay the same on any particular day. There are certain variations, but it comes from the same mine, the same property and is essentially the same thing.

MR. GARRISON: There is no purpose of sending some to Magna and other to Arthur—that would be a mere chance?

A. To my knowledge there is practically no difference. There is a certain variation of course but then it is essentially the same ore.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

MR. WILLIAMS: Subject to the reservation that I have made before, the cross examination of this witness is suspended.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

R-Q. 483. Mr. Conrads, why is it that you now take account of the circulating oil?

A. The circulating oil as I look at it, is a factor which should be considered because that is an oil entering the head of the machine. In order to determine your exact proportions you should have that.

R-Q. 484. The exact proportion of oil present in the apparatus?

A. Yes. Of oil to the solids entering the machine. Formerly, as I stated before, we took no account of this although it was present. Now that really gives an erroneous condition. We have a certain amount of new oil but that is not the total amount of oil entering the head of the machine.

R-Q. 485. That is, this statement of operations down to December 24, 1916, the statement of the amount of oil added is an understatement or overstatement of the actual amount of oil present in the process?

A. That would be under at all times. The circulating load will always carry some oil, and as I stated, I believe this morning, that that might be—it is hard to say just exactly what that would amount to, but we have had our circulating oil built up to pass the amount

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

or even more than that, of the new oil, so that that figure is, I should say, considerably under the total amount of oil entering the head of the machine.

R-Q. 486. Are you acquainted with any facts that would explain why it is that in the later cells of the series you are not able to get off a marketable or at least to get good concentrate, while in the first cell you do?

A. There may be a number of factors entering into that. There are several possibilities or easy possibilities. There may be a considerable amount of free mineral which is more or less protected from oils, either by an oxidized film, a partial oxidization of these particles, or it may be some envelope or protection by free silicious material, for instance, that it would not be cleaned and that the consecutive operations, the grinding and abrasion in passing through the cells and the continuous agitation would tend to free them, or brighten up the surface of it, free it from any protecting envelope of silicious material, for instance, or an oxidized coating, and eventually make it susceptible or wettable as sulphide.

R-Q. 487. In the operation of other concentrating apparatus, such as the tables and vanners etc., is there anything analogous to the circulating load in your flotation machine?

A. There is a practice—It is not universally adopted, but there is a practice which is used in some places of returning a middling product from a concentrating table directly back onto the table. That is, your fin-

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

ished concentrate is delivered to its launder. The middling streak or portion as it comes from the table is laundered to some sort of an elevator which will elevate it to return it to be fed over again to the same table. Now, we have a circulating condition in connection with our retreatment plant. There is a middling product from the tables, and also the tailings from the tables which treat the first, second and third spigots of the retreatment plant classifier. That tailing is retreated in vanners. The vanners do not make a finished concentrate. They make a finished tailing and this concentrate is returned in back to the general low grade, and goes through the circuit again. There is very commonly that middling product, or that product which is between a finished tailing or a finished concentrate which must be taken—which must be circulated and taken care of.

R-Q. 488. Did you make any of these later assays yourself personally?

A. Personally I do not.

R-Q. 489. Are you a chemist qualified to do such things?

A. Well, my work has been such, Mr. Scott, that I have not had time to do it, and I have gotten out of it.

R-Q. 490. Where did you get this information which you read upon cross examination regarding the method of the oil determination?

A. That is our method as we use it at the Magna plant.

Ralph Augustus Conrads.

R-Q. 491. Originated or practiced by your oil chemist?

A. Yes. That is a thing—while I don't run the assays for the oil I have the supervision of that and the dictation, and I have to go into those details and pass upon those things.

R-Q. 492. As I have understood your testimony it is your universal practice to get your finished concentrate solely from the first cells of the series where the maximum oil is present?

A. Yes; our finished concentrate comes entirely from the first cells of the series.

R-Q. 493. And the lower members of the series, where, if anywhere, the oil supply is depleted, is where you get the middling from which is returned to the head of the machine?

A. Yes; the oil is in much less quantity there from the fact that a great deal of it has been removed with the concentrate from the upper cells, the first cells.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

Edward W. Engleman.

EDWARD W. ENGLEMAN, called as a witness in behalf of the defendant, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION,

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 1. State your full name?

A. Edward William Engleman.

Q. 2. What is your occupation?

A. Flotation foreman, Ray Consolidated Copper Company.

Q. 3. How long have you held that position?

A. Three years.

Q. 4. Have you had experience in metallurgical work prior to your engagement by the Ray Consolidated?

A. I did.

Q. 5. You might briefly state your education and experience?

A. You mean college course and everything?

Q. 6. Yes.

A. I graduated from the Missouri School of Mines in 1911, with the degree of mining engineer, and spent two and a half years with the Utah Copper Company at Garfield, Utah, in their experimental department, and spent practically half a year with the Butte Dary Musu Mining Company, as mill superintendent in Deer Lodge, and the last three years I have been down at the Ray Consolidated Copper Company as flotation foreman.

Edward W. Engleman.

Q. 7. When did you first have experience with flotation concentration?

A. At the Arthur plant of the Utah Copper Company, which was in the latter part—about the middle of the year, I guess, in 1913.

Q. 8. At the Hayden plant of the Ray Consolidated, what sort of material was treated by flotation?

A. We treat what we call the vanner low grade concentrate and the slime vanner tailings.

Q. 9. Are these flotation operations under your direct charge?

A. They are.

Q. 10. You are responsible for the conduct of the flotation department?

A. I am.

Q. 11. In these operations what amounts of oil have you used approximately?

MR. GARRISON: Our standing objection, of course, goes to this testimony.

THE COURT: Yes.

A. That is from the beginning?

Q. 12. From the beginning, yes, in a general way?

A. Well, the last quarter—well, we started flotation operations on a commercial scale at the Ray Consolidated plant about the first of October, 1914. That quarter we used 4.31 pounds of oil per ton. In 1915 for the total year we used 4.41 pounds of oil per ton. In 1916 for the total year we used 3.36 pounds per ton. In 1917, beginning January 1st, and

Edward W. Engleman.

for the month of January, we used 20.02, for February 18.77, and for March, 21.19.

Q. 13. Have you a statement setting forth the details of these flotation operations during the period you have referred to?

A. Why, you mean the period of 1917?

Q. 14. I mean from 1914 down to 1917, in March?

A. Yes, I have a quarterly report.

Q. 15. Does your statement represent operations carried on under your direction and supervision?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 16. And you have knowledge of its correctness?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 17. The operations were conducted, were they, and the figures compiled in the regular course of business at the Ray Consolidated Company?

A. They were.

MR. SCOTT: I will now offer this report in evidence that the witness speaks of.

Report marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT
44 for identification.

MR. GARRISON: Are you going to supplement this with details, Mr. Scott, of the daily operations?

MR. SCOTT: He has some further details that he has not tabulated. I think he can answer as to them.

Edward W. Engleman.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 18. Did you prepare this actual table that you have here?

A. It was prepared under my supervision.

Q. 19. Did you dictate the contents?

A. No.

Q. 20. Who did?

A. The statistician does all the compiling of results that we obtain.

Q. 21. Did you furnish him with the figures?

A. No.

MR. GARRISON: I don't see how this paper is relevant at all or competent.

A. Because all these figures—

MR. GARRISON: I was speaking to the court. This witness says that he did not prepare this but that it was done by the statistician.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 22. The work was compiled under your supervision, was it not?

A. Absolutely.

Q. 23. Everything was done under your direction, both in the practical operation and in the clerical work of compiling the record?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. SCOTT: It appears that this report was compiled in the way that all reports of this kind necessarily are.

THE COURT: It looks so.

Edward W. Engleman.

BY MR. GARRISON:

Q. 24. Where did the statistician get the material he used, if you did not furnish it to him?

A. He got it from the foremen that were working for me at the flotation plant. They report each day and furnish the results.

Q. 25. Furnish them to you or to him?

A. They furnish them to me, and I furnish them to him.

Q. 26. Have you the original material all here?

A. I have all the original material for 1917? I have not the original material for all these.

Q. 27. Have you the original material for any of these?

A. For the previous—

Q. 28. What have you for these? I use the same term you did?

A. No, I have not.

Q. 29. You have no material here except for the year 1917—original material?

A. Original material.

Q. 30. Will you be able to answer questions from any records with respect to any other year than the year 1917?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 31. From what source will you get the information to answer those questions?

A. Well, I know that these figures are right.

Q. 32. You misunderstand me. I understand that

Edward W. Engleman.

this paper is a compilation made up by a statistician from reports in your possession; is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 33. You said with respect to the year 1917 that you were equipped here now so that you can consult those original records or copies of them and testify from them; is that correct?

A. I can.

Q. 34. And you say that as to the years previous to that you are not so equipped, is that correct?

A. I haven't the records with me. I can send for them and get them.

Q. 35. Yes. I am not criticising you. I am trying to find out the facts.

MR. GARRISON: I still think this paper is incompetent. It seems to have been made by a statistician from reports that are not here. This gentleman did not make it up, and they are only in lump details anyway.

THE COURT: To what extent does it differ from the others that you have already allowed to go in.

MR. GARRISON: Because the gentleman who made the others said that they made them up, and had the material from which they were made, and they were supplemented in each instance with these daily things that are really useful in cross examination. We cannot cross examine from this.

THE COURT: Was it the testimony as to the other reports that the witness himself made the exhibits from data furnished to him?

Edward W. Engleman.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And in this case the data was furnished, but he did not make the exhibit himself.

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: It is only one step further.

MR. GARRISON: You do not understand my objection, your honor.

THE COURT: I understand, yes. I think possibly you have refrained very much from urging technicalities as to this.

MR. GARRISON: Absolutely, your honor. We do not want to stand on technicalities. If this gentleman will get the daily reports before we cross examine him, from which this is made up, we have no objection, but this is only in lumps, and we have no means of cross examining the witness. If you use 100 tons one day and one ton the next day, the average does not mean anything.

MR. KREMER: Mr. Engleman will furnish those.

MR. GARRISON: I have no objection to its being admitted if they will follow it up with papers that will give that detail.

THE COURT: Do you want to have the witness testify now.

MR. GARRISON: I would prefer to have him testify when he gets his data so we can cross examine him.

THE COURT: I think you had better get it first.

Edward W. Engleman.

MR. GARRISON: I shall object in any event to the note on this exhibit.

MR. KREMER: That note says that the circulating load would increase the amount to over twenty pounds to the ton. I think that should be eliminated. I will mark it out with a pencil.

MR. GARRISON: Mr. Williams is willing to have him go on.

MR. KREMER: We will eliminate the statement on this exhibit that is objected to.

MR. GARRISON: It is understood then, if this examination proceeds that we will not be required to cross examine until the other papers arrive.

THE COURT: That is, this data that has to be sent for—what is that?

MR. SCOTT: The daily details, I understand, Judge Garrison wants, for the years 1914, 1915 and 1916.

Q. 36. BY MR. SCOTT: Is that in tabulated form—those details?

A. It is not. We would have to bring all our records from the office up here, and it is a very difficult thing to do for three years back.

Q. 37. They are not completed in form to bring them up?

A. No, they are not.

Q. 38. They are simply the memorandum books and the report books of all kinds?

A. Yes, and daily assay sheets and oil sheets. Each day has a separate oil sheet and a separate assay sheet,

Edward W. Engleman.

and they would have to be collected for three years previous and brought up separately—that is, each one separately from the other.

MR. SCOTT: Until we find out whether it is practicable to get all these records here, I don't know that there is any object in examining Mr. Engleman. The other witnesses had their records in such form that they could be transported readily, but it seems that these records are not compiled.

MR. KREMER: We might simplify it by offering him as only to the 1917 report, and if we see fit to recall him as to the other years, we can do that after he gets his data.

MR. SCOTT: Well, I will confine the examination to the year 1917, and we will have this part of the compilation in such shape that it can be offered. We will have that done after the adjournment.

MR. SCOTT: Q. Have you directed the flotation operations on a practical scale with upwards of twenty pounds of oil per ton of ore?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 39. During what period?

A. During the months of January, February and March, 1917.

MR. SCOTT: It is understood that we withdraw this exhibit now. It has not been admitted and therefore I prefer to withdraw it altogether.

MR. GARRISON: It has been admitted.

MR. SCOTT: No, it was not admitted.

Edward W. Engleman.

Q. 40. How great a tonnage have you treated in the flotation process with upwards of twenty pounds of oil to the ton?

A. We treated for the month of March 11,063 tons, using 21.19 pounds of oil to the ton.

Q. 41. And in other months how much did you treat?

A. In January we treated 9,300 tons with 20.02 pounds; in February we treated 8,550 tons with 18.77 pounds. The total for the quarter was 28,913 tons, and the average oil added per ton was 20.10. Now, in the month of January was that oil added, inclusive of the circulating oil or not?

A. The oil added in the month of January was new oil.

Q. 42. That is all that is taken account of in the figures that you gave, 20.02 pounds per ton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 43. You simply calculated the circulating oil altogether?

A. Yes.

Q. 44. And was there circulation during the month of January?

A. Yes.

Q. 45. You might briefly describe the flotation plant, and I think it would be well to make a sketch of it so that we may understand the procedure?

A. I have a small sketch here.

Q. 46. It would be a little better if we kept these of uniform size. You may prepare a sketch.

A. (Witness draws).

Edward W. Engleman.

MR. GARRISON: He has a sketch prepared.

MR. SCOTT: If you have one, you may use it. I did not understand that.

A. I have one. Our feed for this plant comes from the retreating plant classifier from the mill, which is what we call our low grade vanner concentrate, and the feed comes to this sump, and we add the oil at that sump, and a centrifugal pump pumps it up into the back, or into a small box feeding two emulsifiers in series. The discharge from those two emulsifiers goes to five Janney mechanical flotation cells in multiple; each cell is fed separately from the other; we make a finished concentrate from each cell. The tailing from each cell goes to a launder and is combined as one product and from these five Janney mechanical flotation machines in series—these five are in series—the concentrate product from the five in series we call middling or circulating load, and that goes back to the sump where it joins the original feed, and then back to the emulsifier, and back through the first five machines in multiple. The tailing from the last series cell goes to waste.

MR. SCOTT: I will offer this sketch in evidence.

Sketch admitted in evidence without objection
and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 45.

Q. 47. MR. SCOTT: About how fine is this material that is treated in your flotation plant?

A. The screen analysis of the headings to the plant are 2.84 on a forty-eight mesh; 3.28 on a 65 mesh;

Edward W. Engleman.

9.91 on a 100 mesh; 12.93 on a 150 mesh; 12.50 on a 200 mesh; 12.93 on a 280 mesh; 45.61 through a 280 mesh.

Q. 48. Is that the only flotation system you have, the one you have represented in this sketch, exhibit 45?

A. Treating this product, yes, sir.

Q. 49. Have you a flotation plant for treating another kind of product?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 50. What is that other product?

A. We have a flotation plant where we treat our slime vanner tailings.

Q. 51. Is that a still finer material than this that you have given the analysis of?

A. Very much finer, yes, sir.

Q. 52. Without giving the whole analysis, can you give in a general way how fine that material is?

A. Yes, sir; 2.22 per cent on a 65 mesh, and 69.05 through a 280 mesh.

THE COURT: Q. What is that, 280 ^{holes} ~~feet~~ to the square inch?

A. Yes, sir, 280 ^{holes} ~~feet~~ to the inch.

MR. SCOTT: I think it is 280 to the lineal inch.

Q. 53. Will you state, Mr. Engleman, the manner in which you estimate the circulating oil in these operations that have been conducted since January 1st with a comparatively large amount of oil?

A. Well, during the month of January we did not determine the circulating oil. It was during the months of February and March.

Edward W. Engleman.

Q. 54. February, yes, I looked at this table wrong.

A. We employed an expert oil chemist to spend two months or two months and a half with us and he determined the percentage of oil in our circulating load, and his reports were submitted to me.

Q. 55. What can you say as to the relation of the results obtained since January 1 with substantially 20 pounds of oil per ton, and the results obtained prior to January 1, with the smaller amount of oil then used?

MR. GARRISON: We object, if the court pleases, if they are not going to give us the benefit of an examination as to the sources of his information.

MR. SCOTT: We are proposing to examine the witness as to his knowledge. We have offered this table in evidence and it has been objected to, but the witness knows the figures prior to January first and I am asking him to testify about them.

THE COURT: If he knows. The objection will be completed if you had not completed it, if you desire to urge it.

MR. GARRISON: My objection is this: He is now going to ask him with respect to results prior to 1917 and he has told us that he hasn't here anything from which he can testify as to the results prior to that year; but what he does have, is not the source of his original memory; it is all based upon data and that data he does not have here today. It is quite obvious that any answer that he gives us now will not be based upon any data which is probative. As I said a moment ago, I have not been technical; I have not insisted upon

Edward W. Engleman.

these gentlemen bringing their original records here; we have trusted to the character of their witnesses not to impose records upon us—or character of records—that were false.

THE COURT: The only question is whether he has information aside from the documents or having refreshed it originally from the documents.

MR. GARRISON: It may be that our objection would be captious if we did not refer to the answer in reference to this document to tell us results; but surely our objection is well founded when he has no independent knowledge. The only knowledge he has is what he obtained from some foreman.

THE COURT: I understand they were asking him if he knew of his own knowledge.

MR. GARRISON: No, he distinctly told us that he knows nothing whatever of his own knowledge. He only knows what was reported to him by these foremen and other men in the mill. He does not pretend to say that he stood and saw the operation from beginning to end. The objection is not captious. It is meritorious.

THE COURT: Well, if this witness knows anything of his own knowledge, not what someone reported to him or someone told him, he can testify; but otherwise, in the face of the objection the court will be obliged to sustain it.

(Question read as follows: "Q. What can you say as to the relation of the results obtained since January 1, with substantially 20 pounds of oil per ton, and the results obtained prior to January 1, with the smaller amount of oil then used.")

Edward W. Engleman.

THE COURT: You are asking for results apparently made up from reports and records made and kept by others. I don't think it is competent. I can not understand on what theory it would be competent.

MR. SCOTT: The witness in all probability has had access to these records here.

THE COURT: Yes, he has read the records.

MR. SCOTT: He has refreshed his recollection and he undoubtedly possesses that recollection still, and having that knowledge now, whether by prior memory or by having refreshed his recollection from original data, it seems to me he is entitled to testify to it.

THE COURT: They have waived the fact that a large part of it is hearsay, but they insist, if it goes in, they must have the records themselves. I think if they are going to waive that part of it, it is waived on a condition, if they are going to waive the strict letter of the law. No, the objection will be sustained.

MR. KREMER: We will qualify this; we will bring in these records and defer the examination upon them until they are here.

Whereupon an adjournment was taken until Monday, April 23rd, at 10:00 o'clock a. m.

Monday, April 23d, 1917.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, are you ready to proceed with the case on trial?

MR. WILLIAMS: I hand your honor a slip from the Patent Office, which the Patent Office attaches to every copy of the patent, which is a copy of the disclaimer.

MR. KREMER: That is not offered in evidence, is it?

MR. WILLIAMS: It is a copy—it has been sent to us by the Patent Office with instructions to annex it to the patent.

MR. KREMER: Are you offering it in evidence?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, we offer it in evidence.

MR. KREMER: To that we object for the reason that the disclaimer is no disclaimer in point of law, for the reason that said disclaimer, instead of relinquishing, extends the scope of the patent. For the further reason that the Supreme Court of the United States having declared claims 9, 10 and 11 of the patent invalid, a disclaimer can not be made by the patentee conditionally, but the claims having been declared invalid, they must be disclaimed in toto. For the further reason that upon the face of the record the plaintiffs and those owning the patent have been guilty of unreasonable neglect and delay in filing the alleged disclaimer. For the further reason that the plaintiffs and complainants and those owning the patent have failed to comply with the sections of the Revised Statutes of the United

States providing when and where and in what manner a disclaimer must be filed. For the further reason that the document here presented is not of a character purporting authority by certification or otherwise, such as to entitle it to admission in evidence in a case of this sort.

MR. WILLIAMS: I further offer in evidence a letter from the Patent Office, addressed to me, signed by the chief clerk of the Patent Office, with whose signature I am very familiar, although I am not testifying, but I presume Mr. Scott will acknowledge that—as follows: “Herewith please find printed copy of subject matter of disclaimer filed by you in Letters Patent No. 835,120, granted November 6th, 1906, to be attached to the original Letters Patent.”

MR. KREMER: That is objected to as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, correspondence between counsel and the Patent Office.

MR. WILLIAMS: I will put it in the position occupied by it in every patent sent out by the Patent Office.

THE COURT: I think it is a mere matter of official detail, the disclaimer itself having been filed, because that was all that was required to give it whatever effect it is entitled to. The objections will be overruled.

MR. KREMER: Both objections?

THE COURT: Yes, both objections.

MR. KREMER: We desire to note an exception to both rulings of the court.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

THE COURT: Exception may be noted.

MR. WILLIAMS: I ask leave to withdraw the original letter in view of the fact that the subject matter has been read upon the record.

THE COURT: Very well. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Scott?

MR. SCOTT: I have made some progress, and I think we will now be able to get through about the end of next week, which will finish everything but the plaintiff's closing, and that will enable us to finish in about three weeks. I think it will be best to withdraw the witness who was on the stand Friday until all the objections can be remedied, and we can examine him in full.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. SCOTT: For that reason I would like to call Mr. Dosenbach to the stand this morning.

THE COURT: Very well. Call your witness.

BEN H. DOSENBACH, a witness for defendant, after being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 1. State your full name.

A. Ben H. Dosenbach.

Q. 2. What is your occupation?

A. My occupation is that of metallurgist and engineer.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

Q. 3. What has been your training and experience in that line?

A. For approximately the past four years I have been engaged in metallurgical problems and the operation of flotation plants and have been particularly engaged during that time in the flotation of ores. Previous to that time I was engaged in milling—in the general practice of milling through the various departments of the Utah Copper Company and the Ray Consolidated Copper Company at Hayden, Arizona.

Q. 4. Where did you receive your education in the line of metallurgy?

A. I received my education at the Missouri School of Mines at Rolla, Missouri, and also at the University of California, at Berkeley, California, having received a degree in mining engineering, and having specialized in metallurgy.

Q. 5. When did you first become occupied in investigating or practicing the flotation process?

A. It was in the year 1913, in April and May.

Q. 6. And for what employer, or for your own interest, was it?

A. I was employed by the Butte Superior Copper Company, now the Butte Superior Mining Company.

Q. 7. Did you have any experience with flotation before your employment with the Butte & Superior Company?

A. I did not.

Q. 8. Did you make any investigation along the line of flotation before your employment by the Butte & Superior Copper Company?

Ben H. Dosenbach.

A. I did not.

Q. 9. And what was your first work in connection with flotation?

A. My first work at that time consisted in observing the action of various oils and reagents that had been used in flotation, in the laboratory and also in an operating plant.

Q. 10. And what laboratory and operating plant was that?

A. The laboratory of the Butte Superior Copper Company.

Q. 11. And what ores?

A. The ores of the Butte Superior Copper Company.

Q. 12. And what apparatus did you use at that time?

A. The apparatus that was in use at that time was what was known as the slide machine.

Q. 13. Have you used other experimental apparatus since?

A. I have used various forms of apparatus since that time.

Q. 14. What was the nature of your employment, that is, your actual position or duties, when you were first employed by the Butte & Superior Company?

A. I was employed as metallurgist.

Q. 15. And you have held that position continuously up to the present time?

A. I have.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

Q. 16. And in that position what particular duties are you called on to perform?

A. Well, my duties consist of looking after any metallurgical problem that comes up, any new developments that arise in the metallurgical connection with the operation of the concentrate end of the mill and also the flotation plant, particularly the flotation section of the mill at the Butte Superior plant.

Q. 17. Did the Butte & Superior Company have a flotation plant in operation at the time you entered their employ?

A. They did.

Q. 18. Will you please give that date, just when it was you entered their employ?

A. To the best of my recollection it was in April or May, and I am fairly positive it was in April.

Q. 19. 1913?

A. 1913. I can look up the records and find the exact date, but I think it was in April, 1913.

Q. 20. About the time the Hyde case was argued in this court, was it not?

A. It was at the time the Hyde case was argued in this court because I was a spectator.

Q. 21. Well, describe generally the form of apparatus and the manner of its operation that was in place at the Butte & Superior mill when you came here, flotation apparatus?

A. In the mill?

Q. 22. Well, wherever it was?

A. At the time I came here and went to work for

Ben H. Dosenbach.

the Butte & Superior Copper Company, there was a flotation plant consisting of two roughers. The second day that I was here the plant was dismantled, and as far as I am concerned I can only speak of the flotation plant as it existed after starting up, having been shut down for a period of six days for remodeling.

Q. 23. You cannot, from your own knowledge, describe the plant as it existed before it was dismantled?

A. I cannot, in all details, no.

Q. 24. Well, if you have any personal knowledge about it you may describe it as far as that extends. How many cells were there, if you know, and matters of that sort?

A. There were, if I remember rightly, upon my first day at the Butte & Superior plant two roughers consisting of four spitzkastens and nine or eleven agitating cells to each rougher, and there was a cleaner in operation.

Q. 25. There was a cleaner?

A. Yes. That is as far as I can go as to the plant before it was remodeled. After the plant had been remodeled I was engaged—and during the remodeling of it I was engaged by the Butte Superior Copper Company so I can testify to that part of it.

Q. 26. And what was the nature of the remodeled plant?

A. The nature of the remodeling was to change the driving mechanism for one thing, to a gear drive; also to increase the agitation of the impellers; increase the speed of the impellers so as to cause a

Ben H. Dosenbach.

greater agitation; also to add additional agitating cells, and rearrangement of the flow sheet, where by a flotation plant was formed constituting of two roughers, having eleven agitating cells each, and four Spitzkastens each.

Q. 27. The extra agitating cells, I take it, received the pulp and agitated it before that went to the cells having the Spitzkasten?

A. Exactly so. There was also a cleaner which consisted of four agitating cells and four Spitzkasten, such cleaner making a final concentrate.

Q. 28. Was this plant, after being so remodeled, the final plant that remained in operation for a considerable length of time?

A. It did for a short length of time, possibly two or three months, when other changes were made and have continually been made up to the present time.

Q. 29. Can you remember the reason for the change being made in this remodeled plant?

A. The changes were principally to increase the recovery and produce a higher grade of concentrate.

Q. 30. Can you state from memory or by refreshing your memory how efficient the operation was when this remodeled plant started to work?

A. I think it would be advisable to look at some notes in order to give the exact figures, because I can't remember that far back as to such things.

Q. 31. If you have these notes in tabulated form you might produce them so that we can have them before us. Or, if you tabulated part of the result?

Ben H. Dosenbach.

A. I have tabulated the results at that time, and for a time later.

MR. GARRISON: Did I understand there was an unanswered question.

THE COURT: I think he has answered.

Q. 32. MR. SCOTT: Have you copies of this tabulation ready or aren't they ready yet?

A. I have them ready.

Q. 33. Are these the copies you refer to?

A. I don't see the copies that you refer to, Mr. Scott, in this list.

Q. 34. Well, have you any tabulation covering the period since you were in the employ of the company?

A. I have.

Q. 35. But there is no copy of it then?

A. There is a notation there which I don't understand.

Q. 36. If you have your copy of that tabulation, Mr. Dosenbach, that you can refresh your memory from, I would like you to state the nature of the results when this remodeled machine was first started up.

MR. GARRISON: I object, if your honor please. There is nothing in the testimony of this witness which justifies him in testifying from personal knowledge to the results of the operations of the machinery of the Butte & Superior plant from some indefinite date in April, 1913, for however long a period the question is assumed to cover. We have sufficient knowledge from the previous evidence on this subject that a gentleman occupying the position of metallurgist and engineer

Ben H. Dosenbach.

does not have personal knowledge of these matters; he has such knowledge as is furnished to him by his assistants or underlings, who are the ones who actually do the probative thing. It may be probative in this case as to how much oil was used at a particular time; it may be the determining factor in the entire case, and it does not require elaborate discussion that that factor should not be put in evidence by one who has and can have no knowledge about the matter, by the nature of the case, excepting such as is conveyed from other and original sources of information. If that is not clear already with respect to this particular witness, I crave the right to cross examine before he be permitted to proceed with his original testimony.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Garrison may cross examine if he wishes. I do not know what he is going to cross examine about. I put the question as to the details of this operation. In regard to the objection I might say that Mr. Dosenbach was in charge of these operations, and that he will testify from the official and original records of the company, and the only reason that I at all hesitate in attempting to satisfy counsel's demands in advance is the great amount of time that will be consumed. We have all these people accessible, the samplers, the assayers, the chemists, and the men who turned the oil on, and we can probably have several hundred employes here who performed each of these individual operations, if necessary. But the witnesses will testify as to operations under his immediate charge, refreshing his memory as to detail from the

Ben H. Dosenbach.

official records kept under his charge, and as far as he uses tabulations he will, upon request, furnish the figures and verify them from the original records, which are too voluminous to bring into the court room.

THE COURT: You may cross examine if you wish. Do you wish to proceed?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You may do so and see how his knowledge is derived.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. GARRISON:

X-Q. 37. When you are asked to give the results of the operations of flotation plants with a view of stating whether they were good or bad or indifferent, upon what factors do you base your judgment?

A. I was asked to give the results of a flotation plant.

(Last question read)

MR. KREMER: We object to this for the reason that at this time it is improper cross examination. If the witness is being interrogated to ascertain whether he is competent to testify to the tables, the question is improper.

MR. GARRISON: I have not the benefit of having the table before me.

THE COURT: If you don't qualify your witness by your own examination or by this cross examination, the objection will have to be sustained. Your objection is overruled.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

MR. KREMER: We are ready to bring all these witnesses here if counsel desires them. There are four or five hundred of them up there ready to come down, but it seems to me as a matter of law that if a man testifies to a condition which exists in an operation over which he has supervision, that that meets the requirement of law as to what was done in the operation. It is not necessary to produce every man that turned on a tap.

THE COURT: Your objection will be overruled, Mr. Kremer. Counsel may proceed with the cross examination and we will rule later on the other objection.

X-Q. 38. (Last question read again).

A. I base my judgment as regards the Butte & Superior flotation plant upon my actual knowledge of conditions which existed in the plant at that time, as my presence was there each day, and I was in direct touch with the operation of the plant. I was in charge of the plant; the men were working the plant under my direction, and I knew what the conditions were throughout the plant at that time.

X-Q. 39. Now please answer the question; I want to know on what factor you base your judgment.

THE COURT: Well, I think he has answered that.

MR. GARRISON: He is stating now, if I may interrupt your honor, the reasons which are going to induce him, as I understand it, to express a judgment. I did not ask him that; I ask you what factor,

Ben H. Dosenbach.

whether the grade of the concentrate, or the amount of the recovery—

THE COURT: You had better make that a little clearer.

MR. GARRISON: I thought the witness understood that, as a professional man.

X-Q. 40. Using the word “factor” to cover such things as grade and recovery and operations of the classifying machines, and various other parts of the operative machinery, upon which, or what part of those do you base a judgment as to the successful or unsuccessful operation of the plant that you are testifying to.

A. On the recovery; on the grade of concentrates produced; the successful operation of the plant and of the various machines that constitute that plant and all other factors which come into consideration in the operating of a plant.

X-Q. 41. The things which induce recovery in this flotation process are, broadly speaking, oils and acids. aren't they?

A. Yes.

X-Q. 42. And you, therefore, as another factor, have to consider the oils and acids used, do you not?

A. I do, and I have.

X-Q. 43. Do you personally measure the oil which from time to time is put upon the material?

A. I have.

X-Q. 44. (Last question read.)

A. I do, and I have.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

X-Q. 45. It is your duty every day, is it, to stand at the oiling machine and regulate it so that it puts the proper amount of oil on the material from hour to hour?

A. It is not, but it is my duty to see that the men who are working for me do that, and ^I check them up.

X-Q. 46. In what way do they inform you that they have done what you told them to do?

A. They submit a report each day, of the amount.

X-Q. 47. In writing?

A. In writing.

X-Q. 48. Are these oiling machines automatic or do they require the manipulation of human beings?

A. They require the manipulation of human beings, as almost everything does.

MR. GARRISON: The latter may be stricken out, because some of them are automatic.

X-Q. 49. Next in regard to the quality and character of the concentrates, how is that determined?

A. That is determined by analysis after a sample has been taken.

X-Q. 50. And who takes that sample? I don't mean the name of the man, but who, in the course of the business, takes the sample?

A. The sampler.

X-Q. 51. Is there more than one of him?

A. There is more than one.

X-Q. 52. Is that submitted to you?

A. That is submitted to the sampling department.

X-Q. 53. Is that submitted to you?

Ben H. Dosenbach.

A. It is submitted to me.

X-Q. 54. It comes to you first?

A. It does not come to me first, but it comes as a result.

X-Q. 55. Then to whom is it first submitted?

A. It is submitted to me as being one of the—

X-Q. 56. (Last question read.)

X-Q. 57. (Continued) You said it was not submitted to you first; now, to whom is it first submitted?

A. Well, I may have misunderstood the other question; I would like to have that re-read; I may change my other answer.

X-Q. 58. Certainly. I have not the slightest wish to confuse you. I want to know this: When the sample is taken by the sampler, what does he do with it; not what somebody else does, but what does he do?

A. He is taking the sample.

X-Q. 59. Then what does he do after that?

A. He submits it to the sampling department.

X-Q. 60. What do they do?

A. They submit it to the assaying department.

X-Q. 61. What do they do?

A. They analyze it.

X-Q. 62. What do they do with it?

A. They make a report of it.

X-Q. 63. To whom?

A. I get the report of that.

X-Q. 64. Does that also determine, not only the recovery, but also the grade?

A. It does.

Ben H. Dösenbach.

X-Q. 65. Who regulates the feed of the material?

A. The operators in charge of the flotation plant.

X-Q. 66. Have they any other title than simply operators?

A. Foremen; there are three of them.

X-Q. 67. And these foremen do they make reports of the rate, and the amount of feed, etc.?

A. They do.

X-Q. 68. What about the quality of the ore; who determines that, the amount of mineral in the ore?

A. That is also determined by the sampling and assay department.

X-Q. 69. Are there separate samplers who take that and take it to the assay department?

A. The same samplers take the original ore as take the concentrates and tailings.

X-Q. 70. And that all comes back to you in the form of written reports from somebody, does it?

A. It does.

X-Q. 71. And from all these original sources you make up these tables that you have been asked about, is that correct?

A. That is correct.

MR. ^{Kremer}GARRISON: I renew my objection, if your honor please.

THE COURT: What principle of the local law of evidence will you appeal to, just in general?

MR. KREMER: Only the general principle that a superintendent or manager of a business who has the personal conduct of the business and has at his disposal

Ben H. Dosenbach.

personally that which indicates the conduct of the business from day to day and upon which the business relies in conducting its ordinary affairs, he exercises a general supervision, he can testify to that which is carried on under his direct supervision, even though it is made from a number of different statements from different sources. It is the same principle of law that will permit a bookkeeper in a department store to testify that Mrs. Jones bought a paper of pins, a spool of thread and a yard of silk upon a certain day. They are entries made in the ordinary course of business. It would be a useless thing and an unnecessary thing to say that we had to call the girl who sold the spool of thread and so on—without prolonging the illustration. I am perfectly serious and I don't want to be facetious in the matter.

THE COURT: The Supreme Court of this state has ruled that the books which you speak of are only memoranda. It would not do for the bookkeeper to come in and say that Mrs. Jones bought a yard of silk. That wouldn't prove it, necessarily.

MR. KREMER: Your honor is right in that assumption. I must show that these entries were made in the ordinary course of business. The mere fact that the books show a certain thing is not sufficient, and this is the test. The thing that makes this competent is to show that they were kept in the ordinary course of business. That is a pre-requisite. The mere presentation of the books is not sufficient. But, if the books are shown to be kept in the ordinary course of business there is a presumption that in the keeping of these accounts and books

Ben H. Dosenbach.

and records of the business, in its course of conduct, are correct, and relying upon that, in giving the direction to your business, there is a presumption based upon that reason that fallacious conditions would not exist because the whole business would be destroyed. That is the evidentiary principle, and that is a prerequisite, and so that is the ground I have earnestly contended that from the very beginning if it is shown that these records are made up in the ordinary course of business and are the records of a going operating concern, where one has had a superintending capacity over them and can identify them as the result of the ordinary conditions of the operation, that that is sufficient. Now, the reason for that, if your honor please, I think becomes apparent. Take the question which your honor now has under consideration. This is not something that is not available. This is something that—if the rule of law is not as I maintain, that it is and I earnestly contend that it is so, but if it were otherwise, we can prove these things; but the rule of law exists solely for the purpose of obviating the necessity of doing such a useless thing as here one would be called to do, to bring down at least, without any exaggeration, fifty or sixty men for the purpose of saying: Yes, that is so; I did it; it is correct. “Do all the duties that you perform in the course of your employment indicate the correctness of your actions?” “Is this true?” “Did you make a mistake?” “No.” “I did not.” “They are all correct.”—Bring each one of them down and it is basically proven, what the law of evidence I think considers a useless thing, a useless

Ben H. Dosenbach.

showing. And for that reason this very same and logical rule is adopted. There is no position that counsel are placed in that would cause them to suffer the slightest embarrassment, because they can attack anyone of these various matters, even to the end of calling the men. I don't think there is any difference in the rule of law of the records of an operation conducted in the ordinary course, under the supervision and superintendence of one who says he knows it to be correct. Now, the test of the credibility of this would resolve itself solely into the impression that the witness created upon the court.

MR. GARRISON: Have you finished?

MR. KREMER: I have.

MR. GARRISON: As far as Mr. Kremer has gotten in his exposition of the law, he has stopped far short of what he has offered here, and I do not think it is worth while to discuss something that is not before us. He says that if they had regularly kept books which are not themselves the books of original entry, but are made up of other original sources of information, these books are admissible. I do not care to debate that with him, if that was what was offered. We have no such thing offered now. We have a table made up by this witness, something typewritten perhaps day before yesterday—it makes no difference when it was typewritten, or when it was composed. It does not purport to be a book of the company made up in the ordinary course of business part of their daily routine, with whatever effect, legally, that might have as evidence. And I most respectfully submit that no authority in any court of justice under

Ben H. Dosenbach.

the common law can be found for giving probative force to a table made up by a witness from not even original sources of information of his own. That is a very doubtful question, if not determined entirely the other way, but certainly not a table made up from original sources of information of which he has no knowledge whatever. That could have no probative force. The very statement that it would take 500 men to justify this table shows the table itself cannot be evidenciary.

THE COURT: Suppose he has made it from daily reports in writing to him by numbers of subordinates? Can't he make a tabulation from those reports?

MR. GARRISON: After they are in evidence.

THE COURT: Bringing his records along, say, "Here are the reports; here are my papers."

MR. KREMER: We will produce all of them—I beg your pardon, I did not intend to interrupt you—if you desire all of these I will produce them; they are all available.

THE COURT: Just a minute. Let the counsel discuss this with the court for a minute or two.

MR. KREMER: I beg your honor's pardon.

THE COURT: I want to know what their position is. Now,—

MR. GARRISON: I have known the rule to be stretched to this extent, for the benefit of the court and solely for the benefit of the court, that where the original sources of information are numerous, such as these reports undoubtedly are, and where the only proof that may be offered, which is these reports has been offered and accepted, the court has then permitted someone

Ben H. Dosenbach.

like an auditor or a supervisor or a superintendent or a manager to tabulate and make a statement which is given him as illustrative of his evidence; but it has no probative force whatever, absolutely no probative force. It simply is illustrative, of his evidence, he having gone through the original sources of information for the benefit of the court and furnished the court with a convenient tabulation. Now, I have never known it to go any further than that.

THE COURT: As supplemental of this report, and you have them to verify.

MR. GARRISON: Precisely so. We have got the cart before the horse, as unfortunately we are so often faced with in this trial.

THE COURT: Let's proceed a little farther. The court will not attempt to limit you. You say you have these reports, but not here.

MR. KREMER: Certainly; we haven't them right here. They will be here as fast as a couple of wagons can bring them down.

THE COURT: My only question is on the attitude of counsel. You must remember we are trying this case according to the established rules of evidence, except as there may be some special rule established by Congress, and I do not know of any local rule or any decision of the Supreme Court that will allow you to introduce books and let a bookkeeper say—or introduce reports and let an auditor say or a bookkeeper "These are furnished to me every day and are represented to be correct." I don't know of it. I think it is rather the other way in this jurisdiction.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

MR. KREMER: I agree with your honor. Naturally we will proceed to supply the original documents.

THE COURT: Since you can supply it and since you have insisted on it you better have these things here and then we will meet these objections when the time comes.

MR. KREMER: We will be very glad to bring up all of the books and reports and they can bring all the men if they want them.

THE COURT: The court is naturally anxious for anything to expedite things, and to expedite things, but it must see that this case is tried according to settled rules of evidence. They have the right to insist upon it, if that is the law. Now, if you have any authorities with you I would be glad to hear them.

MR. KREMER: As to my position, I think I can furnish you with a host of authorities.

THE COURT: We will give you an opportunity to be heard. This objection will be—

MR. SCOTT: May I ask the witness how long it will take to get these original reports? They include all the assay sheets I suppose and many other memorandum and reports?

MR. DOSENBACH: Well, I should say it will take a day, all of today.

MR. SCOTT: Well, then, we will have to withdraw this witness and continue his examination after we are able to obtain these original records.

WITNESS TEMPORARILY EXCUSED

THE COURT: I would be glad to see from both sides, if these questions and these objections to this character of proof are to be offered and this variety of objection interposed, I would like to see the local law, the decisions in point, and others also if there are any that we ought to consider and be controlled by here.

MR. KREMER: A very recent decision and I think your honor probably has it in mind, by our Supreme Court in connection with the record of account, which I think is what your honor had in mind when you said that the book itself would not be evidence—a case decided about 18 months ago—but this was not supplemented by the testimony of the correctness by one who had charge of the records. I think that is the distinction there, otherwise I think that we would quite agree that that was the rule.

THE COURT: You may look up the question and I will hear you later on both sides. In further reference to the point that has come up. Unless the sources from which he made his compilation would themselves be admissible, of course the compilation would not be admissible and would these reports that he received daily from his subordinates of themselves be admissible without verification by the subordinates who made them? That is one of the principles involved in this question.

MR. KREMER: I would say this: That if the report was the subject of something that was conducted under the supervision of the manager or superintendent, and were submitted to him in the ordinary course

of business, they become a course of business. Now, for instance, just use this test, if your honor pleases: Suppose this was an action for accounting. Could there be any question but what these reports would be absolutely conclusive against us, if admitted.

THE COURT: Of course evidence that might be conclusive against you may be no evidence in your favor.

MR. KREMER: Only for this reason and that is because they are interpreted to be self-serving declarations. But the purpose for self-serving declarations did not exist at the time of the making of the reports, so that test is removed.

THE COURT: Well, but this litigation has been pending a long time. Most of these things you are asking about I suppose was previous to the litigation.

MR. KREMER: But there was a time previous to this litigation when all—

THE COURT: All right, we will hear the law on that, but I simply want to hear you.

MR. SCOTT: We will have Dr. Sadtler take the stand for a part of his testimony.

THE COURT: Very well.

DR. SADTLER, called as a witness in behalf of the defendant, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. WILLIAMS: In regard to this question of the character of proof for admitting further operations at the Butte & Superior mine. The plaintiff is de-

sirous of facilitating the presentation of the case, but plaintiff is suspicious of reports that are made up for the purpose of this trial. Now, I take it, that in the records of the Butte & Superior Company in the ordinary course of their business, that from time to time a regular tabulation—in the ordinary course of their business they from time to time prepare a regular tabulation of their operations. Possibly this witness has tabulations made covering periods of time. The point that we are insisting upon is that we should have these things that were not prepared for this trial, but were prepared in the ordinary course of business of the company, and if there is any way of presenting it upon such a basis as that we will not insist upon all the original written sheets or anything of that sort. We do not want to stand for the strict measure, but we do want these records and reports which were prepared in the ordinary course of business, to compare.

THE COURT: There is a way you can get them possibly if you confer together you can arrange the point.

MR. KREMER: My only purpose in making that—anything you want we will furnish you along that line, but it does seem to me that to do that useless and idle thing, which we will now proceed to do, to load up a couple of trucks and bring them into this room—we will give you whatever you want. If you wish Mr. Dosenbach to proceed, Mr. Dosenbach will testify from his notes and from his compilation as to the conditions. Then if you have misgivings as to certain portions of

that testimony you would in turn then demand and say, "Will you furnish us with the copies of those days or those months operations." Very gladly we would do it; very gladly do it. But otherwise we will comply with the decision and the ruling, of course. Of course we are going to get this testimony in and if that is satisfactory to you we will do it, and if we are not able to furnish it or do not furnish it upon demand we, before the motion is made, consent that that portion of the testimony may be stricken out.

MR. WILLIAMS: I do not know how the Butte & Superior Company keeps its records. You and the witness do.

MR. KREMER: I suppose the witness does.

MR. WILLIAMS: Suppose for example' that the witness were to say that on a certain day the operations were as follows:—he would produce a report of that day which he made at that time and his records, would he?

MR. KREMER: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: And then we could have that put in evidence.

MR. KREMER: Yes, I think that is correct, isn't it, my statement—I answered "Yes" because that was my idea.

You would testify upon a certain date the operation was so and so, using a more specific illustration, you used a certain amount of oil. That is made from a compilation of the records submitted to you in the operations over which you had supervision.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

MR. DOSENBACH: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: And you can produce the record for that?

MR. DOSENBACH: I can produce the oil record for that day or any other record of that day.

MR. WILLIAMS: And you have memoranda of this which you made at that time, is that right?

MR. DOSENBACH: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: We will waive the strict measure of proof if we may proceed in that manner.

MR. KREMER: We will be very glad to comply with any such.

THE COURT: Will this witness testify?

MR. KREMER: He will be withdrawn and Mr. Dosenbach will proceed in the regular way.

THE COURT: I understand he hasn't the records with him at this time so ^{that he will} ~~as not~~ have ^{to} ~~him~~ take the stand and leave it again.

MR. KREMER: We have the stipulation and Mr. Williams will ask us to furnish him certain records which we will furnish without bringing the whole office down.

THE COURT: If you think you can negotiate to restrict the record, it will be to the advantage of both, and of course to the court; but the court when an objection is made, will rule on it. Is this witness, Mr. Dosenbach, to testify now, and produce these records later if you call for them?

MR. KREMER: And you can recall him for cross-examination upon them.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

THE COURT: He hasn't them in court then this morning.

Q. 72. MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Dosenbach, what records have you with you today? Suppose I were to ask you what the operations were on a certain day, what have you to show those operations?

MR. DOSENBACH: I have the daily records for the—of all of 1917 with me today.

Q. 73. MR. WILLIAMS: And nothing more?

MR. DOSENBACH: And the daily records prior to that time I haven't with me.

MR. WILLIAMS: You better have these with you before you testify.

THE COURT: Very well, proceed with the witness.

MR. SCOTT: In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I would like to ask what these daily records that he refers to are so as to be sure that they will be such as will be acceptable. What are these daily records, Mr. Dosenbach, for 1917, that you refer to; something that you have compiled from original records or are they the original records?

MR. DOSENBACH: They are not the original records; the compilation of each day's original records.

MR. SCOTT: Supposing you let me see what they are and we will find out so that when we come to it again we will know. What was the nature of the original records? Is there any single original record containing all of the information for one day? Does it all show there for one day on that tabulation?

Ben H. Dosenbach.

MR. DOSENBACH: There is no single record.

MR. SCOTT: How many single records for each day would be necessary in order to put before the court the history of that day's operation?

MR. DOSENBACH: Well, I suppose from 6 to 18.

MR. SCOTT: And these records, what are they?

MR. DOSENBACH: The oil records.

MR. SCOTT: Made by the oil sampler or chemist?

MR. DOSENBACH: Oil foreman. The assay record.

MR. SCOTT: Giving the grade of concentrate, headings?

MR. DOSENBACH: Yes, headings and tailings. The tonnage record samples.

MR. SCOTT: Made by some one in charge of that?

MR. DOSENBACH: Yes. And the oil analysis record made by the oil chemist.

MR. SCOTT: All of these are separate reports, are they?

MR. DOSENBACH: They are.

MR. SCOTT: Are there still more of them?

MR. DOSENBACH: Well, then there is the individual shift report.

MR. SCOTT: What does that set forth?

MR. DOSENBACH: That sets forth the operations of the flotation plant, the amount of oil used, the amount of acid used, the amount of other reagents used, and other factors that are taken into consideration in directing the operations of the flotation plant.

MR. SCOTT: That about covers it?

Ben H. Dosenbach.

MR. DOSENBACH: That will cover it pretty well.

MR. SCOTT: Now, in connection with any particular operation that is required you want those records that Mr. Dosenbach mentions, these original certificates, do you?

MR. WILLIAMS: We may.

MR. SCOTT: Well, do you want them all brought here or do you want to make us a list of your requirements during the examination so that they can be sorted out and brought here in a bunch?

MR. WILLIAMS: We would be willing to call for any particular requirement and give you an opportunity to bring it later.

MR. KREMER: Why can't we proceed then? We will accept that.

MR. WILLIAMS: As I understand it, there is practically nothing in the way of daily reports prior to 1917 that the witness has with him. Therefore he will be unable to give us any information.

MR. SCOTT: In 1917 he has his compilation. He hasn't these original papers that you have been speaking of.

MR. WILLIAMS: And prior to 1917 he hasn't anything except a general tabulated statement which we don't regard as evidentiary until something else is produced.

MR. SCOTT: Well, these tabulated statements prior to 1917 are of course the averages of daily operations, for any of which daily operations he can produce the original memoranda that you refer to.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think that when the witness has brought with him a tabular statement of daily operations prepared not for this trial as I understand—

MR. SCOTT: There is no such thing, they are not prepared in that form for any other purpose.

MR. WILLIAMS: And for that total statement of daily operations then as I understand it, he has none for 1917. We will endeavor to make such a waiver of strict objection as will bring about the production speedily of the evidence that the defendant desires.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Dosenbach, one more question, please. Will it be possible within the limits of time of this trial to prepare a daily statement for the years prior to 1917 corresponding to the daily statement I think you have for this year?

MR. DOSENBACH: It would take quite a long time. I don't know whether it would be possible to get it out or not.

MR. KREMER: The limit of the trial would be proof of this.

MR. GARRISON: I think we would make progress if we have a conference during recess and see what we can do about this thing. Is that satisfactory, gentlemen?

MR. KREMER: Yes.

MR. GARRISON: We will have a conference at recess and endeavor to shorten this thing as much as we can.

Samuel P. Sadtler

SAMUEL P. SADTLER, after being duly sworn as a witness for defendant, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 1. Please state your name.

A. Samuel P. Sadtler.

Q. 2. Doctor, please state your occupation and qualifications to testify on subjects of the kind before the court.

A. I have been a professor of chemistry for many years, but am not now active in that line, but for the last thirty years I have been a consulting chemist in connection with many chemical manufacturing operations, and have particularly practiced as a chemical expert in chemical patent litigation during the last thirty years. Do you want my educational qualifications?

Q. 3. I think so, doctor.

A. I was graduated in 1870 as a bachelor of science from Harvard University. In 1871 I made my Doctor of Philosophy degree in the University of Goettingen, Germany. Since 1871, as I said, I have been teaching chemistry, and for thirty years past actively in the practice of applied industrial chemistry. I have made a particular study of industrial chemistry in most of its branches, and I published already in 1891 a Handbook of Industrial Chemistry for manufacturers as well as students, in which the chemistry of petroleum and of

Samuel P. Sadtler

oils, both fixed oils and fatty oils was thoroughly covered, both the chemical nature of these materials, as well as the manufacturing operations and a study of the products. I have also had special experience in connection with the nature of essential and fatty oils, because I have been since 1880 the chemical editor of the United States Dispensatory, which is a standard book covering a wide range of materials of this kind, particularly for reference in the medical and pharmaceutical profession. I have had a special acquaintance with petroleum matters, however, because, from 1875 on I have been collecting and classifying petroleum and petroleum products, first for the Geological Survey of Pennsylvania, and afterwards for the various parties who desired investigations of these materials, and in that connection I have visited the petroleum fields throughout the country. I have also had, in connection with my patent litigation work, the study of a great many products, both in oils of petroleum and fatty and essential oils.

Q. 4. Have you made any investigation of the processes referred to in United States Patent 835,120, the Patent here in suit?

A. I have personally carried out experiments in that line, and have witnessed a great many other experiments, beginning with the summer of 1914.

Q. 5. I notice that in the opening part of this patent reference is made to certain Cattermole patents, Nos. 777,273 and 777,274, and the text of the patent purports to draw a certain distinction between those Cat-

Samuel P. Sadtler

termole patents and the process of Patent 835120. Can you state whether your investigations have confirmed the distinction there set forth or not?

A. That question is so comprehensive that I would have to analyze it in some detail.

Q. 6. You may take your time, doctor.

A. I would like, before attempting to make any attempt at sharp distinctions—I would like to classify in a general way the processes which involve the use of oil in oil concentration. The first use of oil in this connection of oil concentration would be for the purpose of agglomerating the sulphide and other mineral particles into masses from which the gangue can be separated by various washing out processes. Now, in this category will fall, of course, the Cattermole process of making granules and washing them out by up-cast. In this category would also fall the Haynes invention described in the Haynes patent, and the first process of Everson would also involve the agglomeration or bringing together of the sulphide particles with oil and the washing out process.

The second category is that of producing conditions which will permit a flotation of sulphide particles by attachment to gaseous bubbles in which case the amount of the oil and the character of the oil are varied quite considerably, and will vary, according to practical experience, with the individual ores to be treated. Under this category will fall the patent in suit, No. 835120, and a number of patents of the prior art, viz., Everson Second Process, for example; Froment; the foam effect

Samuel P. Sadtler

method of the California Journal of Technology; and Kirby.

The third category includes those processes in which the particles are caused to float as a film on the water's surface, mainly by reason of the surface tension. A number of patents have been taken out in that line; MacQuisten, and some of the patents of Sulman & Picard.

The fourth and last category is where the sulphide particles are to be floated by the actual buoyancy of the oil, under which category we have the Elmore process, which was also discussed by the writers of the California Journal of Technology, articles, under the name of the "Lake Effect."

I have thus, in a general way attempted to classify the various processes, and with this classification in mind I am ready to take up Patent No. 835120 and discuss it, and incidentally in that connection the differences from Cattermole will be indicated.

In Patent 835120 we have first of all a statement of invention. Now, the statement of invention is one of the earliest parts of a patent, and that is found on page 1 of the patent, lines 9 to 15, and again, lines 28 to 35, we have the following:

"This invention relates to improvements in the concentration of ores, the object being to separate the metalliferous matter, graphite and the like, from gangue by means of oils, fatty acids, or other substances which have a preferential affinity for metalliferous matter over gangue." And again in line 28:

Samuel P. Sadtler

"We have found that if the proportion of the oily substance be considerably reduced, say to a fraction of one per cent of the ore, granulation ceases to take place, and after vigorous agitation there is a tendency for a part of the oil-coated metalliferous matter to rise to the surface of the pulp in the form of a froth or scum."

That last portion, beginning "there is a tendency," is therefore the result of the invention. That is the result of the invention. "A tendency for part of the oil-coated metalliferous particles to rise to the surface and form a froth or scum."

Now we have, following that, a statement as to how this tendency is aided. In lines 35, and following on for some distance, I read:

"This tendency is dependent on a number of factors," and the factors mentioned here are three in number. "Thus the water in which the oiling is effected is preferably slightly acidified by adding, say, a fraction of one per cent of sulphuric acid or other mineral acid or acid salts, the effect of this acidity being to prevent gangue from being coated with oily substance, or, in other words, to render the selective action of the oil more marked; but it is to be understood that the object of using acid in the pulp according to this invention is not to bring about the generation of gas for the purpose of flotation thereby, and the proportion of acid used is insufficient to cause chemical action on the metalliferous minerals present."

That is the first factor which is to be considered in understanding this tendency, referred to before.

Samuel P. Sadtler

The second factor is: "Again, we have discovered that the tendency for the oily substance to disseminate through the pulp and the rapidity with which the metal-liferous matter becomes coated is increased if the pulp be warmed." That is the second factor.

Again: "The formation of froth is assisted by the fine pulverization of the ore, and we find that slime mineral most readily generates scum and rises to the surface, while larger particles have less tendency to be included in the froth." That is the third factor.

Those are the three factors which are mentioned.

Now, turning for a moment to lines 89 to 96 inclusive, we have a statement of the observation of the patentees: "When agitation is stopped, a large proportion of the mineral present rises to the surface in the form of a froth or scum." That is the observation. Now, we have following that a statement from that observation, an expression of a theory:

"Which has derived its power of flotation mainly from the inclusion of air bubbles introduced into the mass by agitation, such bubbles or air films adhering only to the mineral particles which are coated with oleic acid."

This is the only statement of the theory of air bubble flotation as produced by vigorous agitation, which is contained in the patent.

When operating the second alternative process which is referred to on page 2 of the patent, this theory does not apply. On page 2 of the patent, line 103, we have an alternative method given. This alternative method

Samuel P. Sadtler

involves the recovery of the sunk oiled metalliferous matter which may be deposited in the second or third spitzkasten, and, is as follows:

“The products suspended in circuit liquor are removed from the spitzkasten and placed in a vessel in which they are submitted to an additional pressure of air or other gas of from, say, one to two atmospheres or over. On relief of such pressure the bubbles of air or other gas so generated throughout the mass at once sweep to the surface thereof all the metalliferous matter in the form of a froth which can be separated as before.”

It is not dependent upon the entraining of the air by vigorous agitation, but is a secondary process for the recovery of additional metalliferous matter by the generation of bubbles following the introduction of air or gas under pressure in the liquid, which bubbles rise and carry, attached to them, a certain additional amount of mineral particles. None of the claims of the patent give us any theory of oil flotation, neither the theory mentioned on page 1 nor the method referred to on page 2. These claims, therefore, tell us nothing in regard to the air bubble production or the function which was ascribed to it in those lines on page 1. The claims are referred to a froth production as a result of agitation, and in those claims, which have been declared valid by the United States Supreme Court in the Hyde process, this froth production is specified to be in the presence of an amount of oil less than one per cent.

Now, going back to the theory of lines 92 to 96 on

Samuel P. Sadtler

page 1—it is not new to this patent. It is found stated quite clearly in Patent No. 793808, page 1, lines 65 to 79, a prior patent issued to Sulman & Picard in July, 1905. I find it there stated:

“The oiled metalliferous particles resulting from either of the processes above described have the power of attaching to themselves with a greater comparative strength than the gangue particles, the films or bubbles and gas, which exist in the mass, and are thus raised to the surface of the liquor by gaseous flotation. They can then be removed by skimming or other suitable means. The gangue particles unwetted by oil or grease are not floated up with the oiled mineral particles, and thus in the main remain at the bottom of the vessel containing the mixture.”

By the above matter this function of the gas bubbles is clearly stated. Also in Froment, the Italian patent dated 1902. In the third paragraph of this patent we find the following:

“If a gas of any kind is generated in this mass, the bubbles of this gas become covered with an envelope of sulphides, and thus rise readily to the surface of the liquid, where they form a kind of metallic magna.”

I think all the essential features of the theory stated, therefore, on page 1 of Patent No. 835120, can be found in these two prior references which I have mentioned.

Various statements have been made by the witnesses and by counsel in different stages of the Hyde case to the effect that the patentees discovered a new agent in

Samuel P. Sadtler

the air bubbles which, in combination with oil in unheard of minute proportions, and in such proportions performing a new function, accomplish a new and revolutionary result; that under an intense agitation in the presence of a mere trace of oil, such that the metallic particles are coated with a thin, attenuated coat of oil, so thin as to be imperceptible to sight or touch, and so attenuated as to exhibit none of the known properties of oil—air bubbles would be produced and controlled and made persistent; that would firmly attach themselves to the metallic particles, and by their buoyancy float the heavy metallic particles upward to and through the surface of the pulp and form above, and resting upon the surface of the pulp, a floating layer usually several inches in thickness, of a mineralized froth, constituted of such air bubbles carrying the metallic particles. It was so stated at the time that these expressions were used in relation to the invention of the patent, 835120. I do not find this at all in lines 28 to 36, in which the patentees state their invention. They claim only a tendency for a part of the air coated metal-liferous matter to rise to the surface of the pulp in the form of a froth or scum, and as before noted, this tendency, the patent says, is dependent upon a number of factors.

I will now take up these factors in detail and examine as to what rights these patentees have in the claiming of the use of these factors as original. The first mentioned factor was the presence of a small amount of acid. That, however, belongs to the prior

Samuel P. Sadtler

art. Dr. Liebmann, one of the former experts in the Hyde case, (Hyde original record ^{page} case 495) says: "Carrie Everson discovered that preferential ability was rendered more effective and more pronounced if acid was present in the oiled pulp." Later ones of the prior art also use it and comment upon it. We find those references in Cattermole, and California Journal of Technology, and in Kirby.

The second factor is stated to be the use of heat. This also is not original. We find this also referred to already in the Fryer Hill publication on the working of the Everson patent. Dr. Liebmann says (Hyde original record page 544): "The Fryer Hill Publication of 1819 is clearly a further development of the Everson patent. It adds to Everson the use of heat." Kirby also refers to the use of heat if desirable.

The third factor which is referred to in patent 835,120 is fine pulverization. While this was not emphasized by most of the prior workers, indications to show that it was not a new feature are seen. The Italian patent of Froment refers to natural sulphides reduced to fine powder as the subject matter of his experiment. In the English patent of Froment, the patent solicitor, Lake, dropped the word "fine." In Kirby patent we have similar indication that fine pulverization was practiced. On page 3, lines 51 to 55, we have the words: "The water, even near the top, is not clear, but turbid or muddy, with slimes or fine particles of non-coated minerals, which had not settled rapidly enough to get out of the way." The practice and value of fine pulv-

Samuel P. Sadtler

erization is also mentioned in the earliest of the Cattermole patents, which was of course familiar to the patentees of No. 835120.

Q. 7. What was the number of that earlier patent?

A. I will give it to you. The Cattermole patent 763,259, line 90 on page 1 indicates this as follows: "The finer the ore the more compact and cohesive are the granules formed from it, other things being equal." I turn now to the nature of the product disclosed in patent 835,120. The product of the invention is stated in line 35 of page 1 to be a froth or scum." In giving their theory as to the froth production in lines 91 to 96 of page 1 the patentees say: "A froth or scum which has derived its power of flotation mainly from the inclusion of air bubbles introduced into the mass by agitation, such bubbles or air films adhering only to the fine particles which are coated with oleic acid." The claims of patent 835,120 all refer to the froth with no mention of its structure or component parts. The question now to be ^{posed}~~disclosed~~ is: Was this gaseous froth produced by agitation a new discovery? An examination of the prior art will show that it was not. It was produced in the practice of the second method of the Everson patent. The Everson patent, page 2, line 99, to 105, says: "In practice, the concentrate, after thorough agitation of the mass and detachment of the sand, will in this case be preferably removed by means of a constant overflow of water from a washing-out vessel, by which overflow the concentrate will be floated off." We have here, as first stated, the thorough agitation of

Samuel P. Sadtler

the oil, principally to entrain air; second the detachment or settling of the sand; and third, the floating off of the concentrate as an aerated froth. In the Fryer-Hill publication of 1889 describing the carrying out of the Everson process we are told that the action of the revolving tube, the fans and injected acidulated steam causes the lighter portions of the mineral-charged oil to float. This was clearly a mineral-laden aerated froth. I have no paging or number of lines to indicate the exact position of that in the Fryer-Hill publication, but it can easily be found. In the Criley and Everson publication, still referring to the carrying out of the Everson process, we are told that as a result of the operation a thick scum of sulphurets rose to the surface and was skimmed off. As the patent in suit uses the words "froth" and "scum" as synonymous, there is no reason to doubt that this was aerated froth or thick scum of sulphurets full of air bubbles which as described left the hitherto black ore as white as snow, in fact pure silica. We have next the Froment Italian and British patents. We are told by counsel for the Minerals Separation that following the issuing of the British patent, August 8th, 1903, Mr. Sulman saw a publication describing it, and learned thereby that Froment was an earlier inventor of the broad idea of floating oil-moistened metallic particles by air or other gases which had been invented by himself and Mr. Picard. This states the facts. The British patent of Froment says: "If a gas of any kind is liberated in this mass the bubbles of the gas become covered with

Samuel P. Sadtler

an envelope of sulphides and thus rise readily to the surface of the liquid, where they form a kind of metallic magma." It will be noted that it is the bubbles of the gas which rising form the magma. This magma of gas bubbles coated with oil, and covered with an envelope of sulphides is undoubtedly an aerated metal coated froth, which has often been described by plaintiff's counsel as a heavily, armor-coated froth, capable of having considerable superimposed weight upon it. But we are not obliged to trust to our own views on that subject. We have the testimony of Minerals Separation themselves as expressed in the language of patents applied for and issued to them at a considerably later date than the date of patent 835,120. The views held by Minerals Separation Limited as late as 1910 as to the character of the Froment process and as to its being a true gas bubble flotation are clearly shown in the language of two patents taken out by them in that year. First, British patent No. 10,929 of 1910, to Theodore Jesse Hoover and Minerals Separation Limited. In the complete specifications, page 2, lines 47, continuing to page 3, line 4, we find the following: "The object of this invention is to provide simple and effective means for the introduction of air or other gas in a state of extremely fine division into an ore pulp in such a way as to effect the gaseous flotation of certain particles. For example, the patent No. 12,778 of 1902 describes a process of ore concentration which consists in mixing the finely powdered ore with water, adding a suitable oil and then liberating a gas in the mixture so

Samuel P. Sadtler

as to carry the oiled particles to the surface in the form of a froth, and the present invention is particularly applicable to a process of this general type." This patent No. 12,778 of 1902, is the British Froment patent. Again, in this same patent, No. 10,929 in 1910, on page 3, lines 30 to 34, the character of the Froment process is still more expressly stated in the following language: "A number of ways are known for treating an ore pulp to facilitate or to render possible the selective flotation of certain constituent particles in the form of a gaseous froth, see for example the processes described in patents Nos. 12,778-1902, 7,803-1905, 28,173-1908, and 2,359-1909. The present invention may be used in conjunction with ^{any} such process." It will be noted here that the Froment British patent is bracketed immediately with British patent 7,803 of 1905, the patent corresponding to that patent 835,120 as easily productive of a gaseous froth as its result. British patent No. 23,870 of 1910 to Minerals Separation Limited and Edward H. Nutter, in the complete specifications, page 5, lines 22 to 24, after referring to their invention as a flotation process obtaining froth or scums containing metallic components, says: "The processes employed to obtain these froths or scums may be any of the well known flotation processes as described for example in patents Nos. 12,778-02, 29,374-04, 7,803-05, 26,852-08, 28,173-08, 2,359-09, etc." We note here again the bracketing of patent No. 12,778 of 1902 and 7,803 of 1905 as equally valid and available. These two patents, thus bracketed, were the Froment British pat-

Samuel P. Sadtler

ents and British patent corresponding to 835,120. They are declared as equally valid and available for raising froths and scums containing mineral oil. We also note the reference in this patent 23,870 of 1910, to both the patents 12,778 of 1902 and 7,803 of 1905 as well known flotation processes.

We have next, in the prior art, the publication known as the California Journal of Technology issued in November, 1903.

MR. WILLIAMS: If your honor pleases, that not being in evidence, and therefore your honor not having a copy of it, while I do not wish to interrupt the witness, I think defendant's counsel should at least supply your honor with a copy of it. Of course it was gone over thoroughly in the Miami case and your honor has perhaps seen it.

MR. SCOTT: We can furnish the copy.

MR. WILLIAMS: I suggest that you furnish a copy to the court.

MR. SCOTT: The original is on page 34 and continuing.

MR. WILLIAMS: Now, for instance, there is another patent the witness has just referred to, Hoover British patent, 1910—something, and your honor has never seen that. It is not in evidence, and if you will just hand that up when the witness refers to them, I think it would help the court.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

A. Well, next, the publication known as the California Journal of Technology issued in November, 1903.

Samuel P. Sadtler

MR. KREMER: At this time we offer in evidence the California Journal of Technology, the articles found on pages 34 to 41, the number of November, 1903.

MR. WILLIAMS: The only objection that is made to this publication is on the ground of estoppel; this new defense can not be interposed. Although the document is not proved to be a publication, we are satisfied from investigations that we have made that it is, so we do not object to it on that ground.

Objection overruled. Plaintiff excepted.

California Journal of Technology of November, 1903, marked *Defendant's Exhibit No. 47 and admitted in evidence.*

Whereupon an adjournment was had until 2:00 p. m.

2:00 o'clock p. m.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 8. Doctor, do you remember where you left off before the adjournment for lunch?

A. I had mentioned the California Journal of Technology, and given the date of it.

The authors of that publication referred to what they use in their test as consisting of a thin ore pulp and oil, and as being agitated, so apparently—

Q. 9. What page are you reading from?

A. Page 36 of the original pamphlet.

Q. 10. Doctor, if I might make a suggestion, wouldn't it be well to make it clearer, to state what these investigators start out with?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. Well, yes, I might do that. The authors of this article in the California Journal of Technology head their publication, "Experiment on the Elmore Process of Oil Concentration." And a large portion of the article is devoted to and refers to the Elmore processes, which they have designated as the "Lake effect" in their article, but already in their article on page 36 of the publication they show that they are making experiments on entirely different lines.

Q. 11. Before you go on, state briefly what that Elmore oil process is, and whether it falls in one of the classes that you divided the art into this morning.

A. The Elmore bulk oil process which they are principally discussing and referring to repeatedly under the name of the "Lake effect," is one of those processes which I refer to as an illustration of group four, or class four of the first classification that I made, in which the mineral particles are floated exclusively by reason of the light specific gravity of oil layers into which they are taken, and in which they are carried or suspended. It does not depend upon aeration for the production of air bubbles. On the contrary the production of air bubbles is undesirable and is constantly referred to as to be avoided in the carrying out of the Elmore bulk oil process.

Q. 12. Have you any knowledge as to the amount and kind of oil necessary in the Elmore bulk oil process?

A. By reason of the conditions of flotation there, namely, that the mineral particles are to be carried entirely by reason of the lighter specific gravity of the oil,

Samuel P. Sadtler

we are dependent there upon the difference in the specific gravity between the oil layer and water, which is a very small difference with the majority of oils, which have an approximate specific gravity of close to .9, as against 1, which is the specific gravity of water. Now, that same buoyancy of the oil is all there is to cause the raising and flotation of the mineral, and therefore it takes a very large bulk of oil to lift the mineral, and the amount has been repeatedly stated as from 100% to 300%, reckoned on the weight of the ore.

Q. 13. That would be about three times the weight of the ore in oil?

A. From one to three times as much as the ore itself weighed.

Q. 14. That would be one to three times the weight of the ore in oil?

A. One to three times as much as the ore weighed.

Q. 15. And as to the kind of oil, as to its viscosity or any information on that line, in the Elmore process?

A. Yes, it has been repeatedly stated that the oil must be a thick, viscous oil, and a petroleum oil is frequently used for that reason. Then we have there a thick and viscous oil, and one which is not readily floured, as it is termed, or broken up by any incidental agitation.

Q. 16. Have you made any experiments on a small scale with the bulk oil process that serves to confirm these views you have expressed as to the character of the process?

A. I carried out the process by rotating a bottle containing the oil and the floating particles and following

Samuel P. Sadtler

exactly the general direction. I carried out the experiment in a bottle and by a number of rotations of the bottle so that the floating particles containing the oil were passed through the oil layer. The oil was caused to take up a considerable quantity of the mineral particles which adhered in suspension, as it might be termed, in the oil layer.

Q. 17. Did you carry out any experiment using the Elmore procedure, but with a smaller amount of oil or an oil that was not viscous.

A. Yes, experiments have been carried out in that way also.

Q. 18. And what was the result of reducing the quantity of oil or in using a non-viscous oil?

A. In a case where kerosene was taken and an oil which was notably less viscous than the other and particularly where the amount was considerably less than this 100 per cent referred to, a froth was formed.

Q. 19. And what about agitation in this Elmore bulk oil process referred to in that original as the Lake effect? The character of the agitation?

A. The authors, on this page, on page 36 of pamphlet, take up that matter.

Q. 20. Have you any information independent of this article regarding this matter of the degree of agitation that is necessary for or injurious to the Elmore Lake effect?

A. Oh, in regard to the Elmore. A very moderate amount of agitation is sufficient to destroy the benefit of the Elmore process because in the first place the oil layer is more or less broken or floured as it is called,

Samuel P. Sadtler

and that of itself prevents it exercising its floating power, and in the next place the tendency to overcharge as it is termed, soon becomes evident with a very moderate amount of agitation and the mineral drops out so that the Elmore process is distinctly dependent upon the avoidance of agitation, and slow agitation is a particular feature of it. And as I say also the character of the oil is a very important element in this Elmore process and the amount of oil is of course important.

Q. 21. You consider these the three essential characteristics, the large amount of oil, the viscous oil and the avoidance of violent agitation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 22. Now, doctor, following the text of this article somewhat, will you explain to us the nature of the investigation of the authors?

A. As I said before it begins with a reference to the Elmore process of oil concentration, and that is explained and a particular plant is referred to and the process of the operation of this plant is also described, including the centrifugal separator which they say was the latest device which caused this process to be more available commercially than it otherwise had been. And they then proceed to the laboratory method. Now, you do not meet anything in that earlier section which bears on the question of froth formation. It is only a discussion of the Elmore process and the various conditions under which it is carried out. But under the head "laboratory methods," which is really on page 35 of the pamphlet—

Samuel P. Sadtler

Q. 23. What page?

A. On page 35 of the pamphlet we have the following: "In making a test the ore is crushed to a considerable fineness and the proper charge is thoroughly wetted in the solution to be used, usually water, thus forming a thin pulp." So we have the first piece of information—

Q. 24. Before we proceed to that, doctor, I would like to have you explain that a little more in detail, this apparatus for the Elmore process and that method of separating the oil; so that we have it before us.

A. You mean in the earlier part?

Q. 25. Yes, at the very beginning, and that shows a view of the apparatus and on the next page that shows an illustration of the centrifugal separator of the oil which I think you can make clear to us with a few quotations from the text. Well, if in your description, doctor, you will not refer to those numbers because they do not appear on the original and they were put on by a witness, and so do not rely upon identifying anything by those extra letters that were put on there.

A. Well, we have in the first place a reservoir in which the thin ~~oil~~^{pulp} pulp and the oil are introduced.

Q. 26. That is in the upper left-hand corner of the picture on page three—

A. Yes, then we have a cylinder in which a commingling under careful conditions of this ore pulp and oil is to be effected, the commingling being effected there by this slowly rotating screw which causes the oil pulp to be brought into contact with the thick viscous

Samuel P. Sadtler

oil, and yet without too much breaking up of this oil. And then from this it is—

Q. 27. Where is the thick, viscous oil, doctor; where is the oil in that apparatus?

A. The oil goes in from above.

Q. 28. In that vessel showing the screw thread arrangement?

A. Yes, as I understand.

Q. 29. And forms a floating mass?

A. The pulp from the mill is indicated there as flowing in through this tube to the side; thence from that rotating vessel, the mixture comes to rest for the purpose of stratifying and gaining layers. Now, in the upper layer, in the thick viscous oil carrying in it, by reason of its buoyancy and floating power, the mineral, and below that of course is the water and the gangue which is not floated, and any other mineral particles which have not yet been taken up into the oil.

Q. 30. The description of what you have just referred to appears in the second paragraph on page 35.

A. Yes, I am looking for that. The second step of the process is to have again the tailings drawn off at the bottom of the separator, with more oil, for repetition of the treatment, and by means of that there was a separation of the steps, so that the tailings from the first contact of the oil and the flowing pulp are worked again, slowly, with an additional quantity of oil. Now, from the last separator, after the tailings have been worked several times, the tailings are dumped. The mineral-laden oil from this last separator, or from

Samuel P. Sadtler

those separators, is collected together in tank B; that is therefore a collecting vessel in which the mineral-laden oil is gathered, and from that it goes to the centrifugal—however, first at that step it is heated and thinned, to overcome the viscosity, because although that was desirable in the early stages it is not desirable at this stage, and the thinning out of the oil by the aid of heat is desirable. Therefore it is thinned out by heating it, and overcoming the viscosity, and the oil is charged into the centrifugal machines, where the concentrates are separated out by the rapid motion of the centrifugal apparatus.

Q. 31. That is the centrifugal separator illustrated on page 35, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 32. You might just refer to that and explain this separation.

A. Well, they dump that material into a basket of perforated metal, which basket is rotated with rapidity, and in that way the heavier material is thrown to the periphery.

Q. 33. That would be what, the heavier material?

A. That would be the concentrate. That is the feature which these young men discuss at some length in the beginning of the article and which they illustrate also somewhat by the illustrations on the following page, figures 1, 2 and 3, as illustrating the centrifugal action. The theory of the separator is illustrated in these figures, 1, 2 and 3.

Q. 34. Now, I wish, doctor, you would explain what

Samuel P. Sadtler

these writers say under the heading you referred to before, "Laboratory Methods." First quoting the passages you are going to comment on as you go along.

A. We come now to what may be called the original work of the authors of this pamphlet. The prior part of the publication is really comment upon what they had found as stated by others. This pulp used, as I stated a moment ago, is formed of ore and water.

"The oil is next added and the whole charge thoroughly mixed. The mixing or agitation can be done in two different ways; the charge may be agitated very gently, the oil being kept in a single lake and broken up as little as possible consistent with thorough contact of the pulp and the oil." That is obviously following Elmore, and the so-called lake which they obtain is a continuous unbroken layer of oil, which is broken up as little as possible, as stated—as little as possible consistent with bringing the oil in contact, and they note that that operation was performed by that screw working through the cylinder; in this case it is done by gently agitating it in some vessel; the vessel is shown below here; now, the alternative method is given, where the charge may be agitated so violently as to dash the oil up into foam and froth full of ore particles. Thus a very thorough contact of the oil and pulp is obtained. Each method has its advantages and disadvantages and these I will discuss later.

The next section is merely a discussion as to the advantages of using galvanized iron or aluminum or glass, and does not have any particular bearing on the difference in the methods which they employed.

Samuel P. Sadtler

Q. 35. Beginning down below the illustration on page 36, they seem to take up the discussion again, the three methods of mixing.

A. Yes; three methods of mixing are referred to.

"Three methods of mixing may be used. One. By inverting the tube several times, thus allowing the ore to fall through the oil. Two. By rotating the tube in a horizontal position, thus throwing the pulp up onto the surface of the lake of oil. Three. By violently shaking the tube, thus producing the foam effect, or at least shattering the oil into small globules. The second method named there is practically another way of practicing the Elmore procedure.

Q. 36. What is this tube that they refer to—something like what is shown in the illustration of Figure 5?

A. Yes, I will refer to that when I get through with the other one. The third method is "by violently shaking the tube, thus producing the foam effect or at least shattering the oil into small globules." All three of these three methods of mixing may be carried on in the same tube, which is illustrated there in Figure 5, and that is a nearly cylindrical tube, narrowing at the bottom, and then having an opening. It is very much what is known in pharmaceutical manufacturing as an adaptor, or a percolator; it is really a percolator, by which in pharmacy extractions are frequently made. At all events the lower end of that tube is closed by a cork, and the top of course may be closed by a suitable cap, and that makes it possible therefore to shake up the contents of the tube very thoroughly. The strati-

Samuel P. Sadtler

fication that is shown there will be referred to also later.

Q. 37. They have something to say at the bottom of the page about the solution used in the concentration.

A. Yes; as I mentioned before in an earlier part of my testimony, we have here an indication that they recognize the advantage in using an acid solution.

Q. 38. In what passage does that occur?

A. "The solution used in concentration is a matter of some importance. Water is of course used whenever possible, but certain other solutions have important advantages; as before stated, an acid solution is found advantageous." Apparently they did not know at all of the Everson patent of 1885, in which that was already indicated.

Q. 39. Don't they refer to the Everson patent in the first page of that article?

A. Well, they do; I was wrong about that; they do give credit for that feature in the beginning of the article; they recognize that, and state their reasons. "It cleans the metallic surfaces by dissolving the metallic oxide coatings that may have formed on them. It increases the specific gravity of the solution, and it aids in producing the foam effect, which is due to the generation of certain gases." We have here a condition which is indicated of the increasing of the specific gravity of the solution. That is obviously, as will be seen a little later, a matter which bears on the floating power—the buoyant effect of the oil layer as against

Samuel P. Sadtler

the watery solution of increased specific gravity, in producing the lake effect. On the other hand, it states that it aids in producing the foam effect. That is a use of the acid solution for the direct purpose of getting the froth. They explain that as due to the generation of certain gases. Of course that may be so in fact or it may not, but it is immaterial. The advantage of the acid has been shown, irrespective of the fact of its attacking any metallic material by producing gases, simply in illustrating the selectivity.

The next section deals with the specific gravity of the average oil and shows that either acid or salt will raise that specific gravity of water and of course notably a strong salt solution will raise that specific gravity.

Q. 40. The specific gravity of the water?

A. Of the water in which it is dissolved. They obtain therefore a saturated solution of salt at 20 degrees centigrade, containing about 27% of salt, thereby obtaining a specific gravity of 1.204. The reason why they are trying to do this is obvious in the next sentence.

"This gives us a difference of .3 between the specific gravities of the oil and of the solution, and a carrying capacity of the oil three-fold greater than with water alone." That has a very important bearing, of course, on the Elmore effect. But we find more than that indicated: "Not only does it give a greater buoyancy to the oil, but it also aids materially in producing the foam effect, and probably aids in brightening the metallic surfaces." So that we have both the action of the acid

Samuel P. Sadtler

and the action of the strong salt solution indicated, and which in their opinion is desirable for either the production of the lake effect or the production of the foam effect.

The next section on overloading, I think bears entirely on the question of the practice of the lake effect. The question is whether the oil is said to be overloaded, and sinks.

We follow next to the bottom of page 37, with a series of figures giving the results of the experiments with some molybdenite ore. There are six experiments here, which represent one or the other of the two forms of treatment that they carry out. The other three experiments, Nos. 7, 8 and 9, are retreatment experiments; but in the six experiments first enumerated it is perfectly clear that, knowing the amount of ore, the weight of the ore treated and the total amount of the oil, those figures being shown in the second and fourth column—noting those figures we can see at a glance that three of the experiments practically represent the practice of the Elmore method and the other three represent the practice of a method which cannot by any possibility be called the Elmore method, and was designed by them to produce what they call their foam effect, that is, an aerated froth result.

Q. 41. You might refer, doctor, to those relative quantities of ore and oil in the first two experiments, and in Nos. 4, 5 and 6, and tell us what percentages of oil are there stated.

A. The first experiment takes two kilos or two thousand grammes of ore, and 2,400 grammes of oil.

Samuel P. Sadtler

Q. 42. I think if you will refer to the next page you will see that refers to gramms.

A. Yes, it is in gramms. If that is in gramms I will state that again; we get the comparison, then, between the two weights, 2,000 gramms of ore and 2,400 gramms of oil; that is more than 100%. The second experiment takes 2,000 gramms of ore, which is 2 kilos, and 2,000 gramms of oil, exactly 100% per cent of oil. The third experiment takes 1 kilo of ore, a thousand gramms, and 1,200 gramms of oil, the same proportions exactly as in experiment No. 1.

Q. 43. Kg. stands for kilogram?

A. Yes, but kilo is the usual abbreviation.

Q. 44. In Nos. 4, 5 and 6 experiments what would be the percentage of oil relative to the ore by weight?

A. There we have to start with, 100 gramms of ore—those experiments start, of course, with a very much smaller amount of ore, working on a smaller scale than in experiments previously mentioned, but the proportions are the important matter. 100 gramms of ore and 2.1 gramms of oil. That is an amount which is 2.1%, reckoned on the weight of the ore. In experiment No. 5, 100 gramms of ore and 5.3 gramms of oil, or 5.3% of oil. In experiment No. 6, 100 gramms of ore and 8.9 gramms of oil, or 8.9%, reckoned by the weight of the ore.

Q. 45. Now, doctor, if you will follow the text of the following page and explain to us the comments which the authors make on these experiments.

A. "Experiments No. 4, No. 5 and No. 6 show the

Samuel P. Sadtler

results obtained by treating separate samples with small quantities of oil, in a salt solution and agitating violently to produce the foam effect. This method gives the highest grade concentrate of any of the direct treatments here outlined. In experiment No. 6 only about 10c.c. of oil was used for 100 grammes of ore, making this 8.9 grammes was used for 100 grammes of ore. You have got an extraction of 75% with the concentrates running ~~3~~²2.4% of molybdenum sulphide. He says that in the extraction that he used about 10 cubic centimeters of oil.

Q. 46. I notice that on the former page he said 8.9.

A. The specific gravity of that oil, multiplied by 10, would give us the 8.9.

Q. 47. Now what follows that?

A. Well, these concentrates are retreated, and he gives them the results of retreatment, "Samples of concentrate running about 26% molybdenum sulphide from agitating in sulphuric acid solution fifteen minutes."

Q. 48. Is this retreatment or reagitation of the concentrates in accordance with anything you know in the present practice?

A. It is current practice, as I understand, almost universally, and reconcentrating.

He goes on to state this agitation caused considerable occluded gangue to free itself. That of course is the desirable thing and is the object for which all reconcentration is practiced. A small quantity of oil was then added and the material reconcentrated, but there

Samuel P. Sadtler

is the froth effect—that means the small quantity of oil, and vigorous agitation. In No. 9 a concentrate running as high as 50.02 molybdenum sulphide was obtained and the remark is then made that the concentrate such as this would probably be merchantable.

Q. 49. Can you point out a passage in this article where the authors described in particular the characteristics of this foam or froth effect?

A. That is found in a summary which is the last portion of the article, in a summary, a resume, the following suggestion and inferences are obtained. The first "As regards the wetted pulp" and is a matter of theorizing; so is the second paragraph and the third, but we have a separate paragraph headed specially "foam effect," in which their views as to the results they obtained by violent agitation are stated. "The foam effect is produced by a violent agitation, especially in acid or salt solutions."

Q. 50. On page 41 you are reading, is it, doctor?

A. That is page 41 of the article and the very last of the whole page. "This throws the oil into a froth, which is heavily charged with air or other gases. This gas of course gives a greatly increased buoyant force. The oil in this condition assumes a certain load of mineral and holds it in a very stable condition. The charge does not settle and overload on standing as in the case of the Lake effect." Here is a very significant contrast between the results of the foam effect and the results of the Lake effect, expressed in several results. With regard to the stability with which mineral is held

Samuel P. Sadtler

in the foam—in other words, a stable froth holding mineral without dropping it for considerable periods of time; and the statement, too, that the charge does not settle and overload as is the case of the Lake effect or the Elmore bulk oil result, where overloading is one of the matters which they are constantly advising against, or constantly cautioning rather, against. It seems to be this summary and statement there about the foam effect shows very clearly that they understood the various essential matters of the difference, and that they correctly describe an aerated froth; under this name of foam, an aerated mineral laden froth.

Q. 51. Do these other topics on page 38 giving “copper ores” and “copperopolis ore”; 39 “gold ores”; Tuolumne ore; forty “Folsom ore” or do these passages have any reference to the froth or foam effect?

A. They do not appear to have reference to that. We have under that heading “copper ore” the gentle agitation referred to.”

Q. 52. Now, I would like to ask you, doctor, whether with the quantities of oil stated in experiments four to nine inclusive, page 47, what the effect would be if one attempted to produce the Elmore bulk of oil or Lake effect?

A. You could hardly get any appreciable result by practicing the slow, gentle movement of the Elmore method with this insignificant quantity of oil.

Q. 53. In what respect do you find this investigation contrasted there from the ore froth effect like the Lake effect?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. They say here that this method, referring to the violent agitation method, gives the highest grade of concentrate of any of the treatments given therein and that is illustrated in the tabulation.

Q. 54. You refer more particularly to the procedure and the substance used?

A. I don't quite grasp the point of your question.

Q. 55. I will restate the question. In what respect did these investigators describe their process as different from the Lake effect or the Elmore bulk ore process?

A. They refer to it as being a process which, while ready of execution and using this relatively trifling amount of oil, is capable of giving superior results and of bringing about by retreatment, marketable concentrate.

Q. 56. In the matter of agitation, how do they describe their process as compared with the Lake effect or the Elmore process; the same agitation or a different kind of agitation?

A. It is of course a totally different agitation and is and in the very earliest mention of it they state: "Thus a very thorough contact of oil and pulp is obtained." That is very distinctly superior of course to the possibilities of contact by the slow rotation or slow turning of the Elmore process. It rapidly or thoroughly puts the ore in contact with the oil and with the product of the air bubbles which become coated, forming the froth.

Q. 57. Can you have a demonstration here—that

Samuel P. Sadtler

process on a small scale performed, or perform one this afternoon?

A. I understand that it can be done, and it can be demonstrated. Mr. Dosenbach will demonstrate it.

Q. 58. I have asked Mr. Dosenbach to get the material. Will you describe the demonstration which you propose to have him to do for us following the lines of this article?

A. It simply consists in taking a cylindrical—a tall, cylindrical vessel approximately of the general shape of the percolator shown here and introducing the flowing pulp and the amount of oil corresponding by weight to one of the other of the several percentage figures which are given here in experiments 4, 5 and 6, and then stopping the mouth of the vessel with a cork, giving it a violent agitation and shaking it and almost immediately we have the appearance of the foam referred to by the writers, or an aerated froth. It is instantly recognizable as mineral carrying and in other words as a stable froth produced by air bubbles coated with mineral sulphides, and at the bottom of the vessel are seen the tailings of different color and appearance from the mineralized form.

Q. 59. And to what is the flotation due in this process; what does the buoyancy come from?

A. What?

Q. 60. What is it gives the buoyancy to the float in this process?

A. It is entirely due to the air bubbles which are produced by reason of violent agitation, and which as I

Samuel P. Sadtler

say in the presence of this small amount of oil have a selective action and become mineral coated and give us therefore a mineralized froth, as it is termed, made up of air bubbles with mineral coating and mineral sulphides deposited upon them.

Q. 61. Have you heard some of the testimony here regarding mill operations with quantities of oil running upwards of two per cent and higher?

A. I heard what was testified here.

Q. 62. And will you compare such mill operations with the process described, in that particular?

A. We have the same elements present, of procedure, we have the taking of the thin ore pulp, an amount of oil which is small and approximates one of the illustrations mentioned by these writers, namely, in experiment No. 4, and we have the violent agitation brought about by the rotating blades of the agitator, and if the process was to be intermittent as in a single vessel such as we have here in the percolator, the froth would rise on stopping the agitation in that vessel. In practice it is considered more desirable to carry on the process as a continuous process rather than intermittently and in that case the froth passes over and is caught in the adjacent separating box called the spitzkasten over the edge of which it flows.

Q. 63. Now, referring to the operations which have been described here and carried out in the mills with one per cent and less of oil, will you compare such operations with the process described in this article.

A. With one per cent?

Samuel P. Sadtler

Q. 64. Yes, with any quantity down to the minimum that has been described or the maximum for that matter. Do the remarks you have made apply?

A. There is no difference in principle whatever. The amount of oil can be varied within considerable limits, as far as I have observed, and I see no reason why, from any knowledge of the matter that I have, it should not vary within very considerable limits, and form a froth in which the air bubbles and the oil film coating and the selected mineral sulphides make up the result as the mineralized form?

Q. 65. Now, test No. 1 doctor, if you will just state the substances that are to be used in this experiment I will get Mr. Dosenbach to come in and help you perform it?

A. This is as I understand it to be a demonstration of experiment No. 5 as described in this article in the California Journal of Technology, experiment No. 5, taking one-half quantities. Instead of 100 gramms of ore treated, we start with 50 gms. of ore and we wet—and instead of the 5.3 grams of oil we use 2.17 I believe. The ore is molybdenite sulphide, as is the case in the experiment described in this article.

Q. 66. Which is it you are to repeat, No. 5 or No. 4?

A. I understand example No. 5 is the one we are to carry out.

Q. 67. That is you have an amount of oil equivalent to 5.3?

A. Yes, but we will divide that in two, this being 2.65 grams. The oil taken is fuel oil, California fuel

Samuel P. Sadtler

oil, 2.65 grams, 150 c.c. of water, that is three times the amount of water and about four-tenths of a cubic centimeter of concentrated sulphuric acid.

Q. 68. Now, Mr. Dosenbach is ready.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is the mesh of the ore given: what is the mesh of this ore?

MR. SCOTT: This experiment says 30 mesh. We ought to know it. Do you know, doctor?

A. That is what it says here in my memorandum was used, 30 mesh.

MR. WILLIAMS: And of course you will give us a specimen so that we may put it through a screen analysis. And we arranged at the Wilmington trial the way to make these tests was to fix them up and divide them equally, not to have something given out and said to be something like something that you used.

MR. SCOTT: All right, we will let you have a quantity of that. You may divide it into four parts and then you may proceed with what he leaves, to do your experiment.

MR. WILLIAMS: We adopted that in our nine weeks' trial.

MR. DOSENBACH: I prepared for Mr. Williams ahead of time so we can do that.

MR. WILLIAMS: What temperature of water do you expect to use? It seems to be very hot. You didn't tell us.

A. No.

MR. WILLIAMS: What temperature do you propose to use?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. I don't know what was used at Wilmington, I don't recall.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, there is nothing in there about hot water at all?

A. No.

MR. KREMER: Drop your thermometer in and take it.

MR. DOSENBACH: 150 cubic centimeters of water, doctor.

MR. WILLIAMS: At what temperature please?

MR. DOSENBACH: 40 degrees.

MR. WILLIAMS: Forty degrees C.?

MR. DOSENBACH: Centigrade.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is 104° F, is that right, doctor?

A. I can make the calculation. You are going to put the fuel oil in by measure?

MR. DOSENBACH: I am going to drop it out. I have determined how many drops were equal to 2.65 grams. That is the best way to handle this. 75 drops.

(Witness drops 75 drops of oil into the mixture.)

MR. WILLIAMS: I think it should be noted that the amount of oil used is 75 drops?

A. That is down in the record.

MR. WILLIAMS: How much acid?

MR. DOSENBACH: Four-tenths cubic centimeter.

MR. SCOTT: Let the record show that it was shook for fourteen seconds.

MR. GARRISON: What kind of acid was used?

MR. DOSENBACH: Concentrated sulphuric acid.

Samuel P. Sadtler

Q. 69. MR. SCOTT: Now, doctor, will you describe the result of this experiment?

A. The results of this experiment, using the amounts which have been put upon the record and which illustrate the fifth experiment on page 37 of the publication are that we have produced a metallized aerated froth in which the air bubbles are the direct cause of the rising of the mineral and there is practically all of the elements in that that we have in the class known as agitated froths. We have the difference in color clearly indicated between the froth layer and the layer of gangue. It is clear now that there is still more in the gangue and retreatment would be probably very desirable and would be ordinarily practiced. We don't have, in other words, a clear tailing as the thing is now; the tailings would have to be retreated, but that of course is current practice as I say, and with such retreatment it looks to me from the indications as almost certain we would have an excellent separation.

Q. 70. You are familiar with the process of flotation as carried on by most of the large companies are you not, the Butte & Superior and the Utah Copper?

A. I have seen it carried on in a large scale in the mills of the two companies, the Butte & Superior Company and the Utah Copper Company at Salt Lake.

Q. 71. Barring the difference between agitation in a tube and bottle and agitation by mechanical agitators, bearing that difference in mind, what essential do you find that this operation, carried out in this experiment, differs from or resembles the large scale operation?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. It has, as I said before, all of the elements of the process that were carried out in the large scale operations, remembering that in—that this is a so-called intermittent operation that was carried on here, stopping. And when the agitation stops the froth has to rise in the vessel in which the agitation is carried on by shaking. In ordinary practice that is different in appearance because the agitation is going on continuously and the froth is rising at the same time in the side vessel, the so-called separating vessel or spitzkasten and being taken off continuously. That of course cannot be carried on with an intermittent operation as we have here; but the principle of the two is practically the same.

Q. 72. Are you familiar with the bottle test that has been described by the witnesses in the Hyde record which is now a part of this case?

A. I have seen it carried out, and remember the test.

Q. 73. I would like to read the description of that bottle test to you.

MR. WILLIAMS: There is one detail; I don't know what oil was used in that experiment. I did not get a sample of that oil, I think.

MR. SCOTT: I think you got one.

Q. 74. He claimed the oil was a fuel oil, wasn't it?

A. I heard it stated here that this was a fuel oil.

MR. KREMER: I am informed that you were furnished with a sample of that oil; it is called Smelter Fuel Oil.

Samuel P. Sadtler

Q. 75. I would like you to compare this operation under the conditions of the California Journal of Technology article with the description of this operation made by Mr. Chapman, one of the previous witnesses, who testified in the Hyde case, page 208: "Q. Did you ever make any tests of the operations set forth in the patent in suit by performing those operations in a bottle or test tube?"

A. Yes.

Q. 76. Will you describe how you did it?

A. I would take a bottle of the capacity of, say, roughly, 100 cubic centimeters, and in it place 20 grams of ore and 70 grams of water. To this I would add sulphuric acid, equal roughly to 20 pounds of acid to the ton of ore. To this I would add oil by the drop equivalent to one and a half or two pounds of oil to the ton of ore, and agitate vigorously." That is the description of the bottle test which I would like to have you compare with the operation just performed in court.

A. The principle of the two tests is the same—or of the two experiments. If the former be carried out we have here a slightly larger vessel. This is 250 c.c. graduated vessel, and the other was described as a bottle containing about 150, but that is an element of no importance in effecting the operation. We have the corresponding conditions of the ore in a thin pulp with the amount of water mentioned and the oil, and some form of agitation as we carried it out.

Q. 77. Now at a later stage of the trial, doctor,

Samuel P. Sadtler

when we have our apparatus ready and set up in the court room here, can you have repeated for us this same operation upon a larger scale?

A. I expect to do so. I had not finished the part of my answer that I started on this morning, in which I have spoken of the foam effect found in the prior record, and following this California Journal of Technology, I was going to go on and refer to Kirby.

Q. 78. You may do that, doctor.

A. Yes. I shall continue that showing the anticipation of the foam claimed in the patent in suit by additional citation of priority, if you will turn to the Kirby patent, No. 809,959.

Q. 79. Very well.

A. In this Kirby patent we have a violent agitation specified, not only in the specifications, but practically in all of the claims, with an apparatus that it can be shown entrains air. That is, I refer to the rotating arms of this apparatus shown in operation in Figure 1, and shown in detail of construction in Figure 4; resulting in the production of an air froth, and as a supplemental step in the Kirby process, there follows the blowing of air or other gas in at the bottom, with a gentle agitation to loosen additional trapped mineral particles, and throw them to the top for air flotation. That feature is again carried out in the patent in suit, where there is a supplemental process involving the introduction of air without the violent agitation, as a supplemental step in bringing more of the mineral to the surface. In the Kirby process there is produced,

Samuel P. Sadtler

as stated in the Kirby patent, a floating scum; a floating hydro-carbon concentrate.

Q. 80. What pages?

A. I find this in lines 79 to 88, page 1 of the patent. I will quote:

"Second in allowing the hydro-carbon coated particles to float to the surface of the mass and render the separation substantially complete by gently agitating the mass and by injecting gas into the same, and preferably, also discharge into the mass fine streams of the solution. When the separation is completed, the floating hydro-carbon coated concentrate is removed for subsequent treatment."

There is also described in full detail in Kirby's patent at a subsequent step, the action of a skimming appliance, which skims off the floating concentrate.

Then again we have in the Kirby patent on page 2, line 66, the following as illustrating the second step of the process:

"The air bubbles not only do not attach themselves directly to the coated particles and then throw them to the surface, but the air becomes dissolved in the water to its maximum capacity. This dissolved air tends again to separate itself from the water and attach itself in minute globules to the coated particles."

We have here almost exactly the explanation of the second procedure of the patent in suit, in which, air having been dissolved under pressure in the water, when the pressure is relieved that air escapes and operates in the same way to float the particles to the

Samuel P. Sadtler

surface, and of course forms more or less of an air bubble concentrate—a mineral-covered air bubble concentrate. I consider that in the Kirby patent we have therefore an agitation air froth, followed by the supplemental production of a secondary froth by direct aeration, which is very much the counterpart of the patent in suit; primary agitation and secondary aeration.

Q. 81. Upon page 3 of the Kirby patent, No. 809,959, that is page 745 of the volume as my copy is numbered—line 37, I see the statement: "Rotary movement of the charge leaves ^{do the} a floating scum of hydro-carbon liquid air bubbles and concentrates against the curved skimming bar." etc. What significance do you attach to that passage, doctor?

A. We have there the taking off of an aerated froth, which is made up, as stated here, of the hydro-carbon liquid, air bubbles and concentrates. That means air bubbles coated with hydro-carbon liquid, and carrying on their surface a concentrate coating or the mineral sulphide coating, which, together, gives us the mineralized froth from which the concentrate is obtained.

Q. 82. In the patent in suit, No. 835120, the statement is made that it is by reducing the amount of oil below or to a fraction of 1% that this floating froth is obtained. Do you know of any patent issued to any of the grantees of patent No. 835120, in which any statement occurs regarding the amounts of oil which can be used for this same purpose?

Samuel P. Sadtler

MR. WILLIAMS: That question is objected to because it contains an assumption that is not founded on fact. Please quote the language of the patent, and do not state something which is not there.

MR. SCOTT: My question was fair, I think. If you will point the particular error I will try and correct it.

MR. WILLIAMS: The beginning of it.

THE COURT: You are stating something which they claim the patent does not contain, so you had better quote that patent.

(Question withdrawn.)

Q. 83. In the patent in suit in the paragraph beginning with line 16, page 1, reference occurs to a certain Cattermole patent, together with the statement that in the progress of the Cattermole process—"an amount of oil varying from 4% to 6% of the weight of the metalliferous matter present is agitated with an ore pulp so as to form granules—" In the following paragraph is this statement: "We have found that if the proportions of oily substance be considerably reduced, say to a fraction of one per cent. of the ore, granulation ceases to take place, and after vigorous agitation there is a tendency on the part of the oil-coated metalliferous matter to rise to the surface of the pulp and to form a froth or scum." Now, I will ask you, doctor, whether any of the three grantees of this patent have, in any other patent that you are acquainted with, made any statement in

Samuel P. Sadtler

regard to the possibilities of obtaining these froths with the quantities of oil greater than one per cent?

A. I have found statements bearing on this matter in United States Patent 835143, issued to Henry Sulman, which patent is found on page 419.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is not the record that the court has.

Q. 84. Page 749 of the printed record?

A. Yes. This patent to which I just referred was applied for a year and a half after the application for the patent in suit, of which the same Henry Sulman was one of the alleged inventors.

Q. 85. How long after did you say, doctor?

A. It was applied for on October 20th, 1906.

Q. 86. The figure is poorly printed. Is that 1906?

MR. WILLIAMS: It was applied for October 20th, 1905. It was issued in 1906.

A. Well, then, it was applied for six months after the patent in suit; I could not read the figure there. That was April 29th and this is May 20th. It was applied for some six months later than the patent in suit, and by one of the patentees of the patent in suit. We find in this patent, 835143, on page 1, line 53 to 59, the following:

“The quantity of oil employed is not sufficient to cause the flotation of metalliferous matter by the buoyancy of the oil, but the quantity may be sufficient—say 5% or less on the quantity of the ore—to coat the metalliferous particles with ‘a thin film of oil.’”

Samuel P. Sadtler

Now, a mixture under these conditions, and with this amount, mixed in a cone mixer—here is that in lines 66 and 67:

“The mixture is agitated in a cone mixer or the like.” And it may be heated in this cone mixer or a separate vessel. The element of heat is an important matter in this particular patent. It may be heated in this cone mixer or in a separate vessel, and the result of this treatment was stated, and this amount of oil was stated in lines 73 and 76 as follows:

“A froth or scum rises to the surface, containing practically the whole of the metalliferous matter, while the gangue remains in the pulp. This froth may be skimmed off, or allowed to flow from a spitzkasten.”

Again, in lines 76 to 81, showing that it may be skimmed off in the vessel in which it is generated, or taken off in a separate vessel or spitzkasten.

If we turn to the claims of this patent No. 835143, particularly in the last claim, we have information that is important. The last claim of the patent is as follows:

“The herein described process of concentrating ores which consists in finely powdering the ore, mixing it with water containing less than one per cent. of sulphuric acid, adding a proportion of less than 10% oleic acid, agitating the mixture until the oleic acid has come into sufficient contact with the mineral, heating the mixture up to boiling point, until the metalliferous matter has been raised in a froth to the surface; running the mixture over a current of water so that

Samuel P. Sadtler

the froth is floated away by the current, while the remaining mineral sinks; separating the froth and removing the oleic acid therefrom by a solvent." The bringing of the mixture up to the boiling point, as stated here, is shown to be a vital feature, but we have on page 1, lines 96 to 100, a statement which somewhat qualifies that:

"All the contents of the agitation vessel may be heated to the necessary extent which approaches the boiling temperature and by cessation of the agitation the mineralized froth rises to the surface."

Q. 87. In the process of this patent 835,143, I wish you would compare what you have just read as to the cessation of agitation and the froth rising to the surface—compare that with the patent in suit with reference to that particular phase of it. Why does the froth rise in the process in the patent in suit?

A. Following agitation; we have that described in the patent in suit, beginning line 31:

"After vigorous agitation there is a tendency on the part of the oil-coated metalliferous matter to rise to the surface of the pulp in the form of a froth or scum."

Q. 88. Then in line 89 of the first page of the patent in suit?

A. We have the thing again stated:

"When agitation is stopped a large proportion of the mineral present rises to the surface in the form of a froth or scum."

Q. 89. Then in patent 835,143 we have the statement which you just read on page 1, line 99?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. Yes, line 99.

Q. 90. Read that expression again, will you?

A. "And on cessation of agitation, the mineralized froth rises to the surface."

(Recess.)

Q. 91. Before we proceed any further, doctor, I did not notice whether the court was shown the appearance of the top of that froth in the test tube, by taking the cork out.

A. I have observed it.

Q. 92. I would like to have the court look at the top of that to see the distinctive appearance.

THE COURT: What is the distinctive feature?

MR. SCOTT: It is to compare it with others which we will show the court later. I do not know that it is a very convenient vessel for the court to see it in.

(The court examined the bottle or test tube containing the ore and froth.)

Q. 93. The froth and tailings are now separated are they not, by comparatively clear water, and the tailings have practically all settled, haven't they?

A. They seem to have settled out almost entirely.

Q. 94. What, if any difference in appearance do you notice between the floating froth and the settled tailings?

A. I believe I stated before that the froth was of such a color as to indicate the presence of mineral sulphides and the presence of mineral sulphides is recognizable also when you look closely at the froth either

Samuel P. Sadtler

from the side or looking down upon it, and of course you recognize the froth structure, the air bubbles; they show very clearly, and the whole effect of the froth here as looked at from above is that of the so-called coated armor plated, aerated froth produced by agitation. On the other hand the tailings—those which first settle—are relatively lighter—notably lighter—and they are rather darker as you get to the top. And looking at the separated layers, it is evident that the tailings would probably have to be reconcentrated to recover from them the values which are now remaining in them.

Q. 95. I think I will ask you next, doctor, to explain to the court the process described in the Everson United States patent.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Scott, how long is that specimen going to be preserved?

MR. SCOTT: It depends on the wishes of the court and counsel.

THE COURT: As far as the court is concerned, there is no occasion to preserve it unless some of you want it preserved for some reason.

MR. WILLIAMS: I was wondering whether it would not be better—I don't want to interrupt the examination, but I was wondering if I had not better make a little cross-examination on that now, since this is something that is going to be evanescent, here today and gone tomorrow.

MR. SCOTT: I have no objections to your interrupting the examination.

THE COURT: Yes, you may cross-examine.

Samuel P. Sadtler

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

Q. 96. Does not that float look like a magma?

A. It looks like a magma in some degree. In fact I have repeatedly seen aerated froth resembling a magma. I do not take the name magma as excluding the presence of air.

Q. 97. What do you take it as indicating?

A. A magma is different from an emulsion, in that it is more of an open type of mixture and allows of the sponginess which would be due to the presence of air. You frequently see magmas produced after agitation in very many operations—what are described as magmas, and I have associated it in my mind—the word magma—more with a heavy, dense-looking froth, than I have associated it with the mere emulsion mixture of liquids.

Q. 98. A magma is defined as a paste, isn't it, in the Standard Dictionary?

A. It is described as a thin paste; that is a definition which I heard quoted from a dictionary in the testimony.

Q. 99. Although the California Journal of Technology says these experiments were carried on with a salt solution, you carried them on with a sulphuric acid solution?

A. Either sulphuric acid or salt; the particular ones which are there given with the results, were made with salts.

Q. 100. That is, the experiment that you pretend to

Samuel P. Sadtler

repeat was made with a salt solution and you repeat that with a sulphuric acid solution?

MR. SCOTT: I object to the question. There was no pretense that this repeated any individual and particular operation. The quantities were taken from the tabulated statements, and the description was that it might be performed with either a salt solution or an acid solution, and the witness will make it in any kind of solution that counsel wants.

THE COURT: I think it ought to be made clear on the record. The question is proper enough. The objection will be overruled.

A. The experiment was carried out with sulphuric acid because the general principle of producing the foam effect was clearly stated by the writers to be carried out by them either in an acid solution or in a salt solution. The particular experiments which are there enumerated in the tables were carried out with salt solution, so I did not attempt to make the experiment here to carry out anything more than an illustration of the principle, and I did not state that we were following literally everything that was stated as to the experiment cited in that summary.

Q. 101. Then, this experiment was carried out at 40 degrees Centigrade and 104 degrees F.?

A. 104, yes.

Q. 102. And do you find any statement in the California Journal of Technology of the use of heat?

A. No; that is not referred to.

Q. 103. And isn't it characteristic of the Elmore

Samuel P. Sadtler

process, to which the article refers, that heat was not to be used?

A. Heat is undesirable in the carrying out of the Elmore viscous oil effect, yes.

Q. 104. Because it thins the oil?

A. Yes.

Q. 105. And causes it to drop the mineral?

A. There is no point to it in the understanding of the principle of violent agitation, and I did not find any particular caution with regard to keeping down the temperature to a low temperature at all referred to in this article.

Q. 106. In fact you found nothing in the article which told you to use heat?

A. Bearing on that subject.

Q. 107. And yet you used heat?

A. It was used as a warm solution—slightly warm, yes.

Q. 108. And I presume you used it because you had to use it?

A. I don't think so; I think it can be done at ordinary temperature and I think I have done it at ordinary temperature, and I am ready to try it at ordinary temperature.

Q. 109. You are ready to try it at ordinary temperature and with a salt solution?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think the experiment is wholly irrelevant to be in evidence in this case, if your honor

Samuel P. Sadtler

please, since it is shown that he has departed in two very important particulars.

THE COURT: I thought he was repeating the experiment. He has nothing to say about that. I thought it was experiment No. 5; but at the same time it will be allowed in, and it will be a matter of argument. I do not understand that you have made any objection. You can argue it from your standpoint and they can argue it from theirs. You may proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS: Of course it is in evidence only as an interesting experiment.

Q. 110. BY MR. SCOTT: Do you find in the California Journal of Technology a reference to the production of foam and froth in an acid solution as well as in the salt solution?

A. Certainly I did.

Q. 111. In your previous testimony in which you stated that the use of heat was objectionable, were you referring to the Elmore lake effect or were you referring to the process advised by these investigators, using a small amount of oil and violent agitation?

A. I was referring solely to the lake effect, because there the influence of heat has been repeatedly shown to be undesirable, because the most viscous oil is there desirable in the Elmore work, and heat, of course, reduces the viscosity and promotes fluidity of the oil.

Q. 112. And in the foam or froth effect is it your experience that viscosity is necessary?

A. It makes no such difference, and the slight advantage in viscosity of the oil, conducting it at 40° C.

Samuel P. Sadtler

or taking it at about 22° C., which would be the ordinary temperature of this room, would not, to my mind, make any difference in the agitation process.

Q. 113. Can you refer to the passage, doctor, in the California Journal of Technology that you just mentioned which has reference to the use of the acid solution as well as the salt solution?

A. The two are put exactly together as alternatives in the resume under the head of "foam effect."

Q. 114. "The foam effect is produced by a violent agitation, especially in acid or salt solution."

MR. SCOTT: Before passing to the next subject, I would like to wait a moment and have this experiment repeated in a salt solution; it might save time, doctor, if you are ready—well, they do not seem to be quite ready so I might as well proceed.

Q. 115. You may proceed, doctor, with the discussion of the Everson patent, and when you get to a convenient stopping place you can have this experiment repeated. It appears on page 607 of the Hyde record.

THE COURT: The patents that you are discussing are all in the Hyde record?

MR. SCOTT: Practically all of them. Those which are not I will hand to the court separate copies.

THE WITNESS: Shall I go on?

Q. 116. Doctor, I hate to interrupt you again, but there was another matter with reference to Patent No. 835,143 that you were discussing before recess that I would like to ask you about. In the paragraph beginning at line 15 of Patent 835,143 on the first page, and

Samuel P. Sadtler

the following paragraph beginning on line 30, reference is made to an application, Serial No. 262,889, and upon reference to the patent in suit you will find that that is the number of the application for the patent in suit. In view of that fact I would like to ask you what significance you find in those two paragraphs beginning at lines 15 and 30 of the patent 835,143.

A. We have clearly shown in the paragraph beginning line 15 that in the process described in the specifications of that serial number there stated, 262,889, which I find on examination is the application for the patent in suit, 835,120. We have stated there that a mineral pulp is agitated with a small proportion of an oily substance, such as oleic acid or petrol, or other oils, amounting to a fraction of one per cent, until the oil-coated metalliferous matter forms into the froth which can be separated by flotation. With that is contrasted the statement beginning on line 30 in Patent 835,143, which is, "It is now found ——" The basis of this independent discovery— "It is now found that the finely powdered ore has been suspended in water, and is mixed with a small portion of oily substance, say 5% or less—the tendency of which is that the formation of the froth containing the mineral matter is considerably promoted." Greater separation of the mineral matter from the gangue is secured. The result thus claimed is described: "Substantially all of the metalliferous matter is thus raised in the form of a froth." In line 74; and "practically the whole of the metalliferous mat-

Samuel P. Sadtler

ter is raised under these circumstances with 5% of oil."

Q. 117. Does the statement that the formation of the froth containing the oily coated metalliferous matter is considerably promoted—does that indicate any relation between the process of 835,143 and that of 835,120 or not?

A. Well, in patent 835,120 we had a tendency stated as the result of certain steps. Here we have a statement that the formation of froth is considerably promoted; so that the language is probably no stronger in one specification than the other.

Q. 118. Do you find in No. 835,143 where the float is referred to as a froth—do you find any attempt to distinguish between the froth formed by the process of patent 835,143 and that formed by the process of patent 835,120, in structure or in efficiency?

A. We have in this patent 835,143, remaining among the claims the statement of the supplementary removing of the oil and the mineral after the separation has been effected. That is no longer found in the patent claims of 835,120, although the file cover indicates, I believe, that it was contemplated?

Q. 119. The removal of the oil?

A. The removal of the oil from the concentrate.

Q. 120. Well, I would like to refer you to the patent in suit, 835,120, page 2, lines 3 to 8?

A. I see it is not eliminated. I see it also in some of the claims of the patent 835,120 and in—in claim 8 for instance.

Samuel P. Sadtler

Q. 121. Just read the part you refer to of claim 8, the patent in suit?

A. There, the supplementary removal of the excess is referred to.

Q. 122. In what words?

A. "Filtering off the froth and removing the oleic acids therefrom by treatment with an alkali." We have instead of this the use of a solvent taking the acid off, in patent 835,143.

Q. 123. Do you find any material difference in describing the removal of oil between the two patents?

A. The alkali would be the more active probably than the solvent, as a practical matter.

Q. 124. Well, now, doctor, may I interrupt you once more to repeat this experiment, which can be done in salt solution at ordinary temperature.

THE COURT: Mr. Scott, this record you have given me, is that from this court to the Circuit Court of Appeals?

MR. SCOTT: The record you have was printed for this court; we printed the record in this court as well as in the Court of Appeals. We narrated it in the court above.

THE COURT: I suppose these same patents were taken up to the Supreme Court in the record you have indicated to the doctor?

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Everything there that has been referred to except the California Journal of Technology was taken up to the Supreme Court of the United States?

Ben H. Dosenbach.

MR. SCOTT: Possibly it might expedite matters a little if we excuse the doctor and let Mr. Dosenbach testify directly as to what he is doing and the temperature of the solution and so forth.

THE COURT: Take your own course, whatever seems best to you.

MR. SCOTT: I think that will be best. It will simplify the record. Mr. Dosenbach may be recalled for the time being and he can tell us what he is doing.

BEN H. DOSENBACH, recalled in behalf of the defendant, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

I have here a saturated salt solution. The temperature of this 18°, I take it, Centigrade. After placing the thermometer in the salt solution I find that it is 19° C. I have now placed into the glass graduate 150 cubic centimeters of the salt solution, and I will now add 50 gms. of the molybdenite ore.

Q. 72. You are using the same ore that you used in the experiment with the acid solution?

A. The same ore or a sample of the same ore as I used it with the sulphuric acid solution. I will now drop in a sample of the same oil as previously used in the experiment where sulphuric acid was used, amounting to 75 drops of oil, this being the same oil as was used before, what is known as smelter fuel oil, the

Ben H. Dosenbach.

amount, 75 drops being equivalent to 2.65 gms. or 5.3 per cent relative to the ore used. I will now agitate for fourteen seconds.

MR. GARRISON: What happens if you leave the cork in? Does it make any difference if you leave the cork in?

A. None at all. After agitating for a period of 14 seconds a froth is formed of greater volume than that which was formed when using sulphuric acid.

MR. SCOTT: Do you know any reason for the greater volume of the froth in the salt solution experiment?

A. The reason for that would be due to the salt solution producing more of a foam or froth effect, as will be noticed by reference to the agitation of the salt solution itself, which I am now shaking, and a froth or foam forms on the surface.

MR. SCOTT: The witness agitated a bottle containing saturated salt solution and nothing else.

Q. 73. What was the effect of that agitation upon the salt solution?

A. The effect was that a froth was formed on the surface.

Q. 74. And what about the appearance of the water itself, beneath the foam?

A. It is somewhat dense and cloudy, showing the presence of air within the water itself.

Q. 75. Would that same thing take place if you were to shake a dilute solution of sulphuric acid, which was used in the first experiment?

Ben H. Dosenbach.

A. That same thing would not take place.

Q. 76. And it is to the properties of the salt itself then that you attribute the greater volume of froth in this second experiment than in the first?

A. I do.

Q. 77. Does the temperature have anything to do with it; the lower temperature in the second experiment as compared with the first?

A. From the results obtained I would say that it doesn't have anything to do with it, the temperature being lower with the salt solution produced a more voluminous froth than that which was produced at 40° when the sulphuric acid solution was used.

Q. 78. Was this a viscous or thin oil that you used? This smelter fuel oil, in this experiment?

A. A viscous oil.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

X-Q. 79. What kind of salt did you use and what proportion in order to obtain a saturated salt solution?

A. Ordinary sodium chloride, or common salt, I used the proportion as indicated in the California Journal of Technology, which is marked on here, in order to make up the same proportion.

X-Q. 80. Just for the record what is it; you say it is marked on the bottle?

A. It is a saturated salt solution having a specific gravity of 1.199 at 15 degrees Centigrade, the specific gravity equals 23° Be.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

R-Q. 81. Mr. Dosenbach, you helped Dr. Sadtler in that first experiment, performing the real operation for him, did you not?

A. I did.

R-Q. 82. Now, will you just state the quantities of the different ingredients you used and the time of agitation, and so forth?

A. In the experiment where sulphuric acid was used, which was the first experiment I performed for Dr. Sadtler, I used 150 c.c. of water at a temperature of 40° C. I next added 50 gms. of molybdenite ore and next added 75 drops of fuel oil, equivalent to 2.65 gms. or 5.3 per cent relative to the ore used. I next added four-tenths of a cubic centimeter of sulphuric acid. I then agitated this total mixture for a period of fourteen seconds upon which a mineral froth was formed, being about one and a quarter inch to one and a half inches in thickness.

R-Q. 83. You had previously determined, I presume, that the 75 drops of that particular oil amounted to 2.65 gms.?

A. I had previously weighed out 75 drops from the same beaker.

R-Q. 84. What was your purpose in dropping it out by drops instead of measuring it and pouring it in?

A. The oil being viscous I could not determine just how much I used had I poured it out.

Ben H. Dosenbach.

R-Q. 85. You mean it would stick to the measuring vessel and you could not pour out the quantity you measured?

A. It would stick to the measuring vessel or any pipette or burette I may have used.

R-Q. 86. The method by drops you adopted for accuracy?

A. I have.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION,

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

RX-Q. 87. In regard to the mesh of the molybdenite ore. I do not think we have that there stated?

A. That was crushed through 30 mesh.

RX-Q. 88. Crushed to 30 mesh?

A. Through 30 mesh.

RX-Q. 89. Did you make a screen analysis of it?

A. I have no screen analysis of this particular ore, Mr. Williams, other than I sent it to the laboratory to have it crushed through 30 mesh.

RX-Q. 90. And I do not believe the ore has been described. Can you describe it with any certainty?

A. Well, I can describe the ore as being a molybdenite ore containing about two per cent Mo S_2 , molybdenum sulphide, and about four or a little more than four per cent of iron, determined as ferrous oxide.

RX-Q. 91. That is ferrous oxide.

A. That is ferrous oxide, and the balance—I can supply you with an analysis of it if you so desire, but I have it with me, and that is the best of my recollection.

Samuel P. Sadtler

RX-Q. 92. Let us have the analysis later?

A. I will.

MR. SCOTT: I would like the record to show that samples of ore and oil used in the last two experiments were furnished to counsel for the plaintiff, and that a sample of the salt solution will be furnished to them if they so desire.

MR. WILLIAMS: It has been furnished.

MR. SCOTT: And a sample of the salt solution.

DR. SADTLER resumed the stand for further

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 125. Referring again to patent 835,143, and the patent in suit, I would ask your attention to the mechanism described and illustrated for carrying out the processes and ask you to compare these mechanisms?

A. We have in the single page illustration, 835,143, shown exactly the same form of cylindrical mixing vessel with the cone mixer indicated as the form of agitating apparatus. In this patent 835,143 it will be remembered that the statement was made that the froth may be removed from the liquid by skimming or in any usual way or the frothing portion may be separated from the remainder of the pulp by causing this to flow through a spitzkasten, or the like, so that we have the skimming following the usage of the agitator as one described method or the allowing of the contents dur-

Samuel P. Sadtler

ing agitation to flow into a spitzkasten—into spitzkastens where they come to rest and where the froth raises.

Q. 126. You have referred to the two patents containing illustrations of the same cylindrical mixer?

A. Yes, and the same form of agitating apparatus.

Q. 127. Do you notice any difference at all in the apparatus illustrated in these two patents?

A. What is that?

Q. 128. Can you point out any difference at all between the apparatus illustrated in the two patents?

A. I am not able to see that there is any difference in the illustration of the apparatus.

Q. 129. Now, doctor, if you will proceed and give us a description of the Everson patent, and explain it?

MR. WILLIAMS: Page 607, your honor, of the record which you have, 257 in the Miami record.

A. The selective activity of oil for mineral was known prior to the time of Mrs. Everson, having been indicated in the patent of Haynes, but the patent of Haynes did not present the agitation procedure in any way that could be regarded as satisfactory, and therefore I have not cited the Haynes patent as prior art, strictly speaking. It was acknowledged by Dr. Liebmann, one of the experts for the plaintiff, that Haynes disclosed the selective action of oil, and then followed the next step, the disclosure of the Everson patent and I will begin, because we have in the Everson patent therefore the knowledge already existing of the selective action of oil which is stated here, and she describes what she considers to be the action of the acid or acid

Samuel P. Sadtler

salt solution. On page 1 of the Everson patent we find therefore: "The discovery which forms the basis of my invention is that metals and metallic substances in a comminuted state will unite with compounds of fats or oils and acids, and that such compounds will not unite with comminuted quartz or other rocky gangue. The essential feature of the method which constitutes my invention, therefore, consists in commingling with pulverized ore a fat or an oil, either animal, mineral or vegetable, or a fatty constituent or acid of an animal or vegetable fat or oil, or any constituent of a mineral oil, together with an acid, either mineral or vegetable or a soluble neutral or acid salt, for the purpose of effecting a union of the free metal or metallic portion of the ore with such admixed mineral, whereby the same may be retained in the subsequent separation of the quartz or other rock therefrom by washing or other suitable means." That is a broad statement of the invention. There is a great deal of statement then with regard to different types of ores which she has tried and which she has operated on, and an enumeration of a number of oils, mineral and animal, and vegetable, which she has also tried, and an enumeration of the acids which she has used, and that feature of her discovery which uses the oil for selective action in the presence of an acid or an acid salt. These are enumerated. And then have upon page 2 of the patent the first example of Everson, which, as I indicated in my classification of processes is an example of a bringing together by the influence of oil, of metallic particles,

Samuel P. Sadtler

and a washing away of gangue, in that respect somewhat like the prior process or patent of Haynes, and is the essential principle involved, in the Cattermole granular agglutination from which the gangue is washed away. But if we direct our attention to the question of priority of invention in the matter of agitation, we turn to the second example of Everson which we find on page 2 of the patent also beginning, lines 75: "When petroleum or a constituent thereof is used the oil should desirably be first mixed with the ore, then water added containing a suitable amount of free acid, or a soluble neutral or acid salt, the quantity of water being ample for the washing-out operation, which is to follow, and the quantity of acid sufficient to cut the sand away from the otherwise cohering mass. In the case of petroleum or its constituents ^{or} paraffine oil, one or two fluid drams of acid to one gallon of water is sufficient for this purpose. The petroleum which I have used was 30° Baume, and I have found three fluid drams of oil abundant for properly moistening two ounces of heavy ore, or in the ratio of about a barrel of oil to the ton of ore, the amount being, of course, variable with the relative bulkiness of the ore." I would desire to say here that the proportion of oil relative—weight—relative to the ore as used by Everson in the second experiment has been variously stated. I think there has been a variety or form of calculation used, probably, and I desire to say in that connection that it is perfectly easy to get an exact figure as to the percentage of oil that was used by Everson in this second example. The

Samuel P. Sadtler

weight relative to the ore being, of course, dependent upon the gravity of the oil used. In other words, for a definite gravity of petroleum as mentioned you can figure out absolutely what the per cent of oil is by weight relative to the ore. I have figured that out, taking the data that are here given by Everson, and assuming that the oil was, as stated, 30° Be. The exact amount of oil relative by weight to the ore is 17 per cent. Under these circumstances—I have then performed—of course it must be remembered that in line 75 we have stated, “Petroleum or constituents thereof”, which allows us to use petroleum in the form of a paraffine oil, as stated, or a kerosene fraction, if such are found practicable in handling with a particular ore, either can be used under the terms of this definition of Everson. Now, if we use a kerosene of about 40° Be., which is relatively a heavy kerosene, because kerosene starts with about 40° Be., and many kerosenes are much lower than that—if you start with a kerosene of a 40° Be., the per cent of oil by weight on the ore would be much less than 17.

Q. 130. About how much less?

A. I haven't figured it out on 40°. I meant to do so, but I haven't done it. I will do so and give you the figures exactly. The former calculation I probably better state, so as to make it perfectly clear that the figure is accurately determinable. We have stated there three fluid drams of oil for two ounces. That means ounces avoirdupois, of heavy ore. Now, if we multiply these figures by eight we can work the fluid

Samuel P. Sadtler

drams into fluid ounces and we can work the two ounces avoirdupois of the ore into exactly one pound av. of the ore. Therefore we now have three fluid ounces for every one pound avd. If we multiply by two thousand we would have 6,000 fluid ounces or 46.8 gallons, American gallons, to one ton of ore, a ton of 2,000 pounds. Now comes the weight of the oil of 30° Be., which has a specific gravity at the temperature ordinarily taken of 60° F., of .875. One gallon of liquid of specific gravity .875, would weigh 7.27 pounds av. That is based on the weight of a gallon of water which is unity, of course, in specific gravity. At the same temperature that would give us 7.27 pounds as the weight of a gallon of liquid of this specific gravity. Now we have stated that we have by the calculation 46.8 gallons which would therefore weigh 340 pounds. Therefore we have a weight of oil of 340 pounds, a ton of ore of 2,000 pounds, 17 per cent. And the same can, of course, be stated equally for any other quantity of oil. This is the second example then of Everson.

THE WITNESS: The patent continues:

"In the use of petroleum, or of a liquid constituent thereof, like paraffine oil, the condition of the concentrated mass is more liquid than when a vegetable oil and animal oil or a fatty constituent thereof is used, and a somewhat different means or method should be employed for removing the sand. In practice, the concentrate, after further agitation of the mass and detachment of the sand, will in this case be preferably removed by means of a constant overflow of water from

Samuel P. Sadtler

a washing-out vessel, by which overflow the concentrate will be floated off."

First step, the agitation of the mass. Second step, the detachment of the sand. Then, following that statement:

"The devices and methods now well known in wet separation of ores will be suited to this part of the operation, bearing in mind that the sands and minerals are merely transposed, or their relative positions are reversed, because the sand is heavier than the mixture of mineral, oil and acid. A proper selection of devices for this purpose will be apparent to those skilled in the wet separation of ores."

That is all we have as to the carrying out of the operation for the removal of the concentrate. The after discussion is as to the treatment of the concentrate.

I would also note that Everson practically makes a third example on page 3 of the patent, line 17.

"It is also not essential to my invention that the acid or salt employed with a vegetable oil be added to the oil before the incorporation of the oil with the ore, as it is entirely practicable, at least in most, and possibly in all cases, to first mix such oil with the ore and thereafter add the acid, as set forth in the use of petroleum."

I said we have a first example, which is of the type of agglutination of the mineral particles and oil, and the washing out of the various minerals from the gangue. We have a second and a third example which contemplate mixing the oil and the ore before thinning

Samuel P. Sadtler

out and as the statement is made here, that it can be done, as set forth in this in the use of petroleum, we may assume that the agitation also is to be considered as a feature of the third example, as well as of the second.

Q. 131. What can you say, doctor, as to this suggestion of Mrs. Everson's that a proper selection of the devices for this purpose will be apparent to those skilled in wet separation of ores," which occurs on line 111, page 2 of the patent?

A. I consider that that refers to the use of the agitating apparatus, and to the use of the flowing off apparatus of the type that is commonly now known as the Spitzkasten type. It was at that time possible to find forms of apparatus for agitation and for the flowing off feature following the agitation, and the saving of the froth.

Q. 132. Do you know any instance of apparatus of that character being known and used prior to August, 1886, the date of this Everson patent?

A. Yes.

Q. 133. Or prior to 1885, the date of the application for it?

A. I have two patents that I will refer to first. The first of these patents is this patent No. 266,219, dated October 17th, 1882. This, of course, is in a different art and is a patent for a piece of apparatus to be used in an entirely different connection, but the only point that is important here is the question as to whether we had aerating and agitating apparatus of a kind suit-

Samuel P. Sadtler

able to be used for the purpose to which Everson alluded. Here in this patent, which is for a churn, the following statement of its results in line 57 to 59, referring to the construction of a rotating apparatus—the object of these channels is to aerate the milk and the cream, as the machine is turned.” We have here clearly enough an aeration in connection with rapid agitation shown there. In other words, we have a form of apparatus there for aerating in connection with agitation, and that is of course what is to be done if we are to produce an aerated froth.

MR. SCOTT: I offer this patent in evidence.

Patent offered in evidence marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 48.

MR. WILLIAMS: It ought to be noted on the record that this patent is given as an example as apparatus for the concentrating of ores, and we find that this device was a churn for churning cream into butter.

THE COURT: I was just thinking that our mother's egg beaters at the same date would have done the same thing.

THE WITNESS: I did not bring in everything that could be thought of; I merely said it was an aerating and agitating machine.

THE COURT: It is a form of apparatus that might perform the same purpose, so I will admit it.

Copy of patent 266,219 admitted in evidence, marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 48.

Samuel P. Sadtler

THE WITNESS: The second apparatus is a churn also, but the possibilities are still more clearly indicated. Patent No. 306,441, F. J. Sullivan, October 14th, 1884, and I call attention there to the statement at the bottom of page 1.

"I make the parallel parts of each dasher close together, so that the air is sucked down between them by the rapid rotary motion of the circular part, and thus the entire cream is aerated. This process of distributing air through the cream is assisted by the perforations *R*, by which I have obtained butter in two minutes, and herein is one of the great advantages of my invention."

I call attention also to the fact that the single claim of the patent specifies aeration. He says "and close together, the better to agitate and force air into the cream, substantially as set forth and described, for the purpose set forth."

This still more clearly indicates a type of aerating and agitating apparatus than the other. Those are two citations from an entirely different industry, but bearing on this question of concentration and agitation.

THE COURT: The quick concentration of milk into butter.

MR. SCOTT: I offer this *§* second patent in evidence.

Patent 306,441 admitted in evidence without objection, marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 49.

Whereupon further hearing was adjourned until Tuesday, April 24, 10 a. m.

Samuel P. Sadtler

Tuesday, April 24, 1917, 10:00 a. m.

SAMUEL P. SADTLER resumed the stand for further

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

BY MR. SCOTT:

Q. 134. Doctor, I think last night when the court adjourned you were giving a description of some kind of apparatus which you considered suitable for the Everson process, and in existence at the time the Everson invention was made. If you have not finished your answer, you may continue?

A. I cited two forms of apparatus, both taken from what might be called the dairy industry. I will next cite an apparatus which is already of record, namely, the extract from the treatise on the chemistry of the manufacture of soaps and candles, which was introduced by Dr. Byrne to illustrate a form of apparatus which was capable of entraining air by means of rapid agitation, (page 402 of the original Hyde record). We have an illustration there of the apparatus, and the description is the description of the class of soaps which are made by the aid of this apparatus. The heading is "Floptant Soaps." "Under this title are designated those soaps which, when in a state of paste, are batted or inflated with air, by which means its buoyancy becomes such that the soap floats in water." And after describing the material from which these soaps are made and the process of preparation, we have in the

Samuel P. Sadtler

last part of the description: "When the mass is in perfect fusion it is agitated with a twirling fan, figures 54 and 55, until it froths and foams to the top of the vessel."

I consider this apparatus as a form of apparatus which is perfectly adapted to the process of aeration in connection with agitation. If a soap in the form of paste could be inflated with air by agitation, it is obvious that the relatively thinner, floating pulp, admixed with oil, could be aerated by the same form of apparatus, by the use of agitation, which is of course capable of being done by power as well as by hand. That is the third illustration of the apparatus adapted for aeration by means of agitation, which results in the production of an aerated froth under these conditions.

The fourth illustration in the prior art goes to another industry. In the purifying of linseed oil it is necessary to carry on a purifying step in which the crude oil is to be aerated with a view of causing the separation of impurities, and I find in a book which was published in 1882 (*Die trocknenden Oele*, by Louis Edgar Andes, published in Braunsweig, 1882), and which I have bound and which has been in my possession in my library since 1883, a description of the apparatus known as the "cataract" machine, and photographs have been made, illustrations have been made of the apparatus, that is, a page showing the apparatus together with a title page of the book, and I will translate and put in English, therefore, the description. The description begins on the preceding page, on page 37,

Samuel P. Sadtler

and is continued on page 38, where this figure is given, at the top of the page, where reference is made to the entraining of air. But I will read the whole description:

"The cataract machine built by the stock company for the manufacture of machines and the oil industry at Barell, in the Grand Duchy of Oldenberg, appears specially adapted over all other machines of like character used for the rapid purification of oil, to displace them in use, and the same therefore deserves entrance into all varnish and lacquer establishments. Figure 6, on the following page shows a vertical section through the machine. The oil to be purified is filled into the iron cylindrical vessel up to a certain mark. On turning the rotating wheel F, the blades, F1, are moved in rapid rotation. The oil rises in consequence of the action of centrifugal force on the walls of the vessel and is then thrown by the baffles, kk, and a ring lying above and is thrown together into the middle. The oil therefore makes a circuit and during this circuit there is so intensive a mixing and so powerful an agitation, and thereby so intimate a bringing in contact with the atmospheric air as can be obtained by no other machine and can be accomplished in no other way. Therefore this machine adapts itself very well to the purifying of oil; and in addition to that can also be used for the mixing of varnish or lacquer with colors. The stock company above named builds this 'cataract machine' of from twenty to four hundred liters capacity, and such a

Samuel P. Sadtler

machine of one hundred to one hundred twenty-five liters capacity with iron vessel and rotating cover, together with the large driving wheel for hand use costs 250 marks f.o.b. Barell. Larger machines are delivered, provided for power driving by means of pulleys."

That is the description and the apparatus shows very clearly that we have there a powerful agitation, that agitation especially adapted for the entraining of air because of the construction shown, that is, the upright baffles and the rotating ring which serves also as a horizontal baffle, and, as described in the account, the oil thrown first to the side by centrifugal power is then deflected and thrown in by reason of the horizontal baffle and that action of the vertical baffle; and, as stated in the description, the oil makes a complete circuit and thereby entrains the air and is brought in most complete contact with atmospheric air. This is adapted for the carrying out of aeration by agitation and we will show the Everson process with the aid of it.

MR. WILLIAMS: You said agitation by aeration. You did not mean that; you meant aeration by agitation.

A. I meant it the other way.

MR. WILLIAMS: Just change it, if you please.

MR. SCOTT: If there is no objection to the photographic copy instead of offering the whole book I would like to offer the photographic copies of the pages.

Samuel P. Sadtler

MR. WILLIAMS: I think you ought to include the previous page which has the greater part of the description.

MR. SCOTT: I will add that to it, the preceding page.

Q. 135. MR. WILLIAMS: This book, you say, has been in your library. Is it, so far as you know, a book of general circulation?

A. This book was got by me, together with other books on these technical industrial subjects, from a bookseller in Germany and undoubtedly it has gone into general circulation in the linseed oil industry. It is by a standard author, quite well recognized, whose works have been translated into English and are well known to everybody connected with the linseed oil and varnish industry. Andes is the name of the author. I had it within a year after it was published.

MR. WILLIAMS: In view of the obvious irrelevancy I certainly shall make no further objection.

MR. SCOTT: I have offered the photographic copies to which I take it there is no objection if I file the additional page.

The photographic copies of two pages of the book were marked defendant's Exhibit 50.

Q. 136. MR. SCOTT: On page 2 of the Everson patent, at the paragraph beginning with line 93 reference is made to the use of petroleum or of the liquid constituents thereof like paraffine oil. I think you referred to that passage yesterday, but I do not

Samuel P. Sadtler

know that you discussed it in full, the nature of the oils that are indicated by the language I have just quoted.

A. I had not finished my prior art apparatus.

Q. 137. You hadn't? I thought that was the last thing you had. Well, postpone that question, then.

I come now to the prior art apparatus to be found in the metallurgical industry, and I have a copy of Ure's Dictionary of Arts and Manufactures and Mines, published in 1860, in which we have forms of rotating blade agitators, and in which we have forms of separating boxes or spitzkasten, both of which forms of apparatus are of interest in connection with the descriptions in the Everson patent. The first of the rotating apparatus were designed for other purposes, but are entirely adaptable to the purpose which we have in mind at the moment, which is the rapid rotation with entraining of air by means of rotating blades. On page 356 is shown such a form of apparatus, figure 1419. There it is used for other purposes, and it has a cap, but with that cap removed it would be perfectly adaptable for the purpose of aeration, having blades rotating very analogous to the forms of apparatus we have in mind. This illustration is found on page 356 of Ure's dictionary, volume 3, figure 1419. The illustrations of the separating boxes known as spitzkasten are found on page 332 of the same volume.

Q. 138. Give the number of the figure please?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. Figures 1379 and 1380, and on page 335, figure 1385. There we have a combination of spitzkasten boxes operated together just as is shown in some of the illustrations of the patent in connection with this formation of aerated froth and collecting the same and separation from the gangue material.

Q. 139. Is that all you wish to refer to, doctor?

A. That is all I wish to refer to.

Q. 140. Then point to the court the different illustrations before we pass on, the pictures are so small you can put the book on the edge of the desk?

A. Very well. The one illustration is of the rotating blade apparatus, and the other two are of the separating boxes.

Q. 141. THE COURT: Well, this is simply for the purpose of showing that at the time of this invention—

MR. SCOTT: The patent was in 1885.

THE COURT: At the time of that patent there were such appliances?

MR. SCOTT: That is the object.

THE COURT: I have no doubt you can find such things in different branches of the art.

THE WITNESS: This is all metallurgical.

Q. 142. THE COURT: The chemistry part of it, I suppose?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 143. MR. SCOTT: Did you state who that dictionary was published by?

A. Ure's dictionary, edited by Robert Hunt. This

Samuel P. Sadtler

is already the fifth edition of Ure's dictionary, published in 1860.

Q. 144. You have no reproduction of those views?

A. No, I haven't.

MR. SCOTT: We will have them prepared and offer them later.

MR. WILLIAMS: You did not state what purpose they were used for?

THE WITNESS: These were used for metallurgical purposes, not exactly as they would be used for the purpose referred to in the patent, but are entirely adaptable for those, by reason of their construction.

Q. 145. MR. SCOTT: Are they agitating mechanisms?

A. I am referring particularly to the agitating mechanisms.

Q. 146. What are they described there for, agitation or for what purpose?

A. This was employed for the excluding of the fine refuse and slime ore by rapid rotation, as it is stated.

Q. 147. What are the spitz boxes that you referred to used for?

A. They were used for what might be called classifying the ore according to the different grades of fineness.

Q. 148. Does that complete your discussion of the apparatus?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. No. I have yet one more.

P. 2859, L. 3, insert "and refer to the great chemist of the sixteenth century" after "Century"

—Agricola's work
on the Metallurgical Art, first published in 1556, 361 years ago, and I have one of the illustrations of this work of Agricola now for the first time, I believe, in complete English form of translation, and this illustration shows me very clearly the exact form of rotating paddle adapted for use for agitation with entraining of air—exactly the form that is used in a number of pieces of apparatus which we are using at the present time, and the apparatus is described here—here are the upright axles, and the large rotating one, and the paddles and this was primarily of the year 1556, and appears in the English translation of Agricola's Metallurgical Art, which has been issued by Herbert Clark Hoover in 1912.

MR. WILLIAMS: Where is the original book?

THE WITNESS: The original book is on the table.

Q. 149. MR. WILLIAMS: Do you remember the page?

A. 299. 299 is the page.

Q. 150. When was this book published?

A. It is dated on the front page.

MR. SCOTT: 1912. We are quite unable to prove the fact that this book was originally printed in 1556.

MR. WILLIAMS: You could call Mr. Hoover, couldn't you?

Samuel P. Sadtler

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Hoover could not prove it either. It is a book that exists only in museums and on collector's shelves; it being a well known fact we thought possibly you would stipulate the date of Agricola.

MR. WILLIAMS: It is quite evident, your honor, that it is not capable of proof and there is no proof as it stands, as to the publication prior to our invention, and I have not read the article. It is a very interesting picture. I am not prepared to say whether we will let it in without objection or not, but we will give that matter consideration.

THE COURT: I remember in the Hyde case you went back to Herodotus.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. (Laughter.)

MR. SCOTT: If I remember correctly, you failed to prove the date of Herodotus's birth also.

MR. WILLIAMS: I will look at the book. I will move to strike it out after I read it if I think necessary.

MR. SCOTT: You can take the book home with you.

THE COURT: Do you offer this exhibit?

MR. SCOTT: Yes, sir, I offer the photograph of the illustration from the work of Agricola.

THE COURT: It will be admitted tentatively.

Photograph from work of Agricola admitted in evidence and marked DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT No. 51.

Samuel P. Sadtler

THE WITNESS: That completes my statement on that subject.

Q. 151. Referring to this Everson patent, line 93, page 2, will you explain a little more fully the character of the oils that are indicated by the expression "petroleum or a liquid constituent thereof, like paraffine oil."

A. We have that same expression—we have that form of expression in two places; in line 75 also: "When petroleum or a constituent thereof is used," indicating that Mrs. Everson contemplated the use of any petroleum fraction that would be found adapted for the purpose. We have it also in line 93: "In the use of petroleum or liquid constituent thereof," and she takes the case of paraffine oil as one of those liquid constituents of petroleum. I gave in the discussion of this patent yesterday the calculation that if you take the petroleum which she used, and herein referred to specifically as used in the particular experiment mentioned, an oil of 30° Be., and as stated here there was 17 per cent by weight of the ore taken. I also said that if you took a lighter fraction or a constituent of petroleum of lighter gravity, the weight would reckon out as less than that; for instance, if you took 40° Be., which is about the heaviest gravity of the very heaviest kerosene, which is frequently called paraffin, and in England is called paraffin oil—the calculation comes out differently. The actual specific gravity corresponding with the figure 40° Be. is .8235, and calculating the weight of a gallon

Samuel P. Sadtler

of oil or liquid of that gravity, and calculating from that the percentage on to a ton of ore, you get 15.9 per cent instead of 17. Of course there are kerosenes which run from 40 Be. up to 54 and 55 and more. I can readily substantiate that by reference to standard works on petroleum recently issued of the highest authority, as to what are the gravities of commercial kerosene oil as made from different types of crude oil; it would range from 40 to 58 gravity.

MR. WILLIAMS: I move to strike that out because we are not concerned with what kind of a kerosene are made today, but only with the kinds of kerosene that were made in 1886.

THE COURT: Well, it may be illustrative. Of course the court knows and we all know that there is a time in this case to which the evidence must relate, but it may be illustrative. He has a right to discuss the art of today and contrast it with what it was then, without it perhaps being so very material to this issue. The motion will be denied. If it is not entitled to any consideration, the court will give it none in making up its decision.

Plaintiff excepted.

Q. 152. MR. SCOTT: Doctor, you may explain the expression?

A. I will say that I know of my own knowledge what kerosene was in 1885.

Q. 153. Then you may state, if you will, what kerosene was in 1885, and other petroleum constituents as referred to here?

Samuel P. Sadtler

A. Kerosene in 1885 as I was acquainted with it—it practically all was made from Pennsylvania oil—it ranged considerably above 50° Be. in gravity; distinctly above.

Q. 154. Did you explain this Baume scale of liquids lighter than water, such as these oils that you are speaking of, as to the numbers indicating the Baume degree increases, the substance is heavier or lighter?

A. As the numbers increase the substance is lighter.

Q. 155. That is, 50° oil is lighter than 40° oil?

A. Yes. The ordinary gasolene which is sold to-day is ordinarily 62° Be.; a very light gasoline may be up to 80° Be., and the extremely volatile material which is now being made on a large scale from casing head gas by pressure and chilling runs up to 90° Be., which is very, very light. Then we go down to the range of 50° Be. in kerosene oils, or a little over, and we get down below that to 30° Be. and lower than that for lubricating oils.

Q. 156. Was there any difference in the amount of volatile constituent in kerosene in 1885 and today?

A. No, not that I am aware of. The same range is found in crude oils now as it was then.

Q. 157. I meant in the manufacture of kerosene as a finished product; I think you call it flash point—was its flash point higher or lower than it is now?

A. The grading of kerosene by means of a flash point was in current use at that time, and they were carefully brought within a space range by the exclu-

Samuel P. Sadtler

sion of their volatile portions, so as to conform to the legal fire test or flash test.

Q. 158. I would like to refer you, doctor, to two newspaper articles that are in evidence in the Hyde case; they have become known in this suit as the Fryer Hill publication and the Criley-Everson publication, and if you will explain to the court the nature of the disclosure of the process?

A. The Fryer Hill publication appeared in October, 1889 in the Daily Herald Democrat of Leadville, Colorado, and is headed: "An Important Invention." After referring to the particular ores which are important to be treated, we find the following statements in regard to this process or invention:

"The first unimportant means of testing the new system having proven so incontestably the correctness of the theory, other larger and more capable means have been employed. The whole system of concentration appears to be based upon the recognized affinity of the lighter forms of sulphuret in silver ores for oil. Petroleum is the oil now being used for the purpose by the parties having these experiments in charge, and appears from its density to possess the requisite adhesiveness to effect the result desired. The ore is first crushed and rolled to such a degree of fineness as to enable it to pass through a 40 mesh screen, and while dry is thoroughly mixed with oil, after which it is placed in a circular tank or receiver, through the center of which runs a rotating hollow tube. To the

Samuel P. Sadtler

bottom of this tube is attached on two opposite sides a couple of fans, the lower edges of which are unevenly cut, in order to send in the revolution the lighter particles of the ore and the oil mixed to the outer sides of the drum or cylinder. This hollow rotating tube—

THE COURT: This is already in the record?

MR. SCOTT: This is already in the record.

THE COURT: I don't see any necessity of the doctor reading it; it is in there. Any comment he wants to make—

THE WITNESS: I will then proceed with the comments.

THE COURT: It is already in the record; we have it before us.

A. (Continuing): I would call particular attention to that portion of the account which begins: "The action of the revolving tube" which is the tenth line, "the action of the revolving tube, the fans and the injected acidulated steam causes the lighter portions of the mineral bearing oil to float to a point just above the center of the receiver, where there are suspended two semicircular doors which, when the oil has passed above them, laden with its precious freight, are raised and the superfluous water allowed to drain through slight perforations in the bottom of the semi-circular doors, after which the mineral-laden oil is carefully removed to settling tanks" and so on—That is not material. Now I desire to comment on it in this way. We have described there a form of apparatus involv-

Samuel P. Sadtler

ing rapid agitation and involving at the same time aeration. The conditions are to be recalled, that is we have this revolving tube with fans and injected acidulated steam. Under this condition there is no doubt but what we have the conditions for the aeration of the mixture and the production of the froth. If the froth rises and the construction of the apparatus—I should say, before going on farther the semi-circular doors as first in position act as baffles. They hang vertically; they interrupt the rotary motion of the flowing pulp and undoubtedly act in the entraining of air and in that way we get the result which is noted. When the froth has formed, which is of course mineral-bearing froth under this condition, these doors are to be raised. Now, I want to make some comment on that latter portion, then, of the operation. The language describing the results of the operation of the Everson process, as here given in the Fryer Hill publication, and the action of the revolving tube, the fans and injected acidulated steam, it is stated cause “the lighter portion of the mineral-charged oil to float,” and then, as stated before, that is taken off. Now, in the first place, there are no lighter portions of a layer of petroleum oil, such oil as is used here, if we consider the question of oil only, as petroleum oils do not stratify in layers of unequal gravity. But if the oil were thoroughly aerated, as is indicated by the reference just preceding, by the action of a revolving tube, the fans and the injected acidulated steam, then the aerated

Samuel P. Sadtler

layer, or air froth, would be lighter than either any excess oil or water, and would float, as stated in the account of the results obtained. I desire to emphasize that fact, that it is impossible to consider that expression "the lighter portion of the mineral-charged oil," to refer to an oil layer, because oil don't stratify. In the second place, the use of the word "float" here used is understood when one considers the production of an aerated air and oil froth, and has no proper meaning if we simply suppose that an oil layer of the compact Elmore type is to be understood as the layer which is taken off. The word "float" indicates that we have a mass of aerated, mineralized material, or "bubbles," in other words, coated.

In the third place, the reference to this lighter portion which floats to the top as the "mineral-laden" shows it to have been an air froth, mineral-laden, because of the selective action of the oil and the agitation used. An un-aerated layer of compact oil, like that used in the Elmore process, would carry the mineral particles in the lower layers rather than in the upper layers, as has been noted by various ones of the plaintiff's expert witnesses as well as by counsel in discussing the Elmore layer, and overloading of that Elmore layer with mineral particles.

In the fourth place, drainage away from a froth "through the slight perforations in the bottoms of these semi-circular doors" is easy and practical, whereas drainage of the water from a compact oil layer by the means indicated would be very difficult to effect, as

Samuel P. Sadtler

the oil would pass out largely with the water through the perforations in the doors. And in the fifth place, mineral particles from the lower strata of the assumed compact oil layer would speedily clog the "slight perforations" in the semi-circular doors; or, if they passed through would make it impossible to get clean tailings. As the ore is stated to have been a silicious one, the tailings would have been very light colored and the contamination would at once be apparent. I conclude, therefore, if, as stated in this Fryer Hill publication, the "lighter portions of the mineral-charged oil" float off, it is because a froth has formed which becomes "mineral-charged." That seems to me to be the clear interpretation of these words.

Q. 159. You have an apparatus of the character described here, doctor?

A. That apparatus has been constructed and was shown in the Miami case, an apparatus constructed as nearly as might be according to the description given in the Fryer Hill publication, and it will be shown here as illustrative of the Everson process.

Q. 160. It will be shown here and operated as soon as it is ready?

A. Yes.

Q. 161. Have you considered this Criley and Everson publication appearing on page 740 of the Hyde record?

A. In the Criley and Everson publication, in which we have of course the direct association with the name